A REPLY

TO PROFESSOR BOURNE'S

"THE WHITMAN LEGEND."

By MYRON EELLS, D. D.

25 CENTS A COPY

FOR SALE BY
THE STATESMAN PUBLISHING CO.,
WALLA WALLA, WASHINGTON.

Rd. O.

A REPLY

Edward G.

To Professor Bourne's

"The Whitman Legend"

1802-47

119426

BY

MYRON EELLS, D. D.

25 cents a Copy

WALLA WALLA, WASHINGTON
THE STATESMAN PRINTING COMPANY
1902

PREFATORY

S. W. Moss, of Oregon City, author of the Prairie Flower, was one of the immigrants of 1842. He was a man who cared at that time but little for religion, and less for missions. In fact he hardly cared to become acquainted with a missionary, for he thought that anybody who was foolish enough to become a missionary, especially to the Indians, was not the kind of man with whom he wished to have anything to do. Hence when he arrived near Dr. Whitman's station in 1842, he went rather past it, without going to it. But it was found that his party needed some provisions or things which could be obtained at the Doctor's, and he was detailed to go and procure them. When he met the Doctor however he found him a very different man from what he expected a missionary to the Indians to be, was much pleased with him and their acquaintance ripened into real friendship, so that when the Doctor was at Oregon City he made the house of Mr. Moss his home. When Mr. Moss in advanced years, bent with age, was asked what he thought of Dr. Whitman as an American, he straightened up his bent form, his eyes brightened much, so that they spoke as well as his lips, and he said with emphasis and life, "He was an American of Americans."

A Reply to Professor Bourne's

"THE WHITMAN LEGEND"

By MYRON EELLS, D. D.

Member of the Washington State Historical Society; Honorary Member of the Oregon Historical Society; Author of Indian Missions on the Pacific Coast, Ten Years at Skokomish, Father Eells, Life of S. H. Marsh, D. D., History of the Congregational Association of Oregon and Washington, The Twana, Clallam and Chemakum Indians, and various pamphlets.

Vol. IV THE WHITMAN COLLEGE QUARTERLY No. 3

[Entered at the Post Office at Walla Walla as second class matter.]

IN THE American Historical Review for January, 1901, is a paper by Prof. E. G. Bourne, of Yale University, entitled, "The Legend of Marcus Whitman," read by him the previous December at the meeting of the American Historical Association. In the Annual Report of the Historical Association for 1900, Vol. 1, pages 219-236, is a discussion of the above paper by Prof. W. I. Marshall, of Chicago. In September, 1901, Prof. Bourne published a volume entitled "Essays in Historical Criticism."* In this his paper is revised and enlarged so as to cover 107 pages. These gentlemen attempt to prove that the story that Dr. Whitman saved Oregon or any part of

*This is one of a series of volumes published by the Professors and Instructors of Yale University, "as a partial indication of the character of the studies in which the University teachers are engaged."

it to the United States, or even dispelled any ignorance about it, or that he went east in the winter of 1842-3 for this purpose, or that he did anything worth mentioning to stimulate the emigration of 1843 is without foundation. It is perfectly proper that the other side of the question be heard.

In this pamphlet the writer will discuss mainly the later essay of Prof. Bourne, it being evidently the result of his mature study, together with Prof. Marshall's paper. The figures in parentheses refer to the pages in their publications.

In 1883 the writer published a pamphlet entitled "Marcus Whitman, M. D. Proofs of his work in saving Oregon to the United States and in promoting the immigration of 1843." This will be referred to as "Eells' Whitman Pamphlet."

A short statement of Dr. Whitman's work from 1842 to 1843 is that an order from the American Board to discontinue his station and that of Mr. Spalding had been received by him in the fall of 1842; there was need felt by the missionaries in Oregon of Christian families to settle near the Indians so as to set them a good example and take from the missionaries most of the secular work; that Dr. Whitman also learned that influences were at work in the east, especially at Washington, which might cause the United States to lose Oregon, because (according to these representations) it was of very little value, and it was impossible to take emigrant wagons to the Columbia;

that hence the Doctor went east during the winter 1842-3, in company with A. L. Lovejoy most of the way; went to Washington where he found real danger, and where he gave such information to President Tyler, Daniel Webster, secretary of state, and others that he obtained the promise that these negotiations should be suspended until he should prove that he could lead an emigration of wagons through; that he did all he could to stimulate people to join the emigration already forming and that in this line he accomplished much; that he went to Boston and attended to the missionary business, and then that he led the emigration through, thus saving Oregon or an important part of it to the United States. But it is stated that the national object was the chief one which induced the Doctor to go when he did, and that had he gone solely for the other reasons, it would have not been until the next spring.

This pamphlet will be divided into four parts: (1) A discussion of some points in the publications of Messrs. Bourne and Marshall which affect their reliability and that of their arguments; (2) points in which the writer agrees with them; (3) points in which he differs from them, (4) the evidence to prove that Dr. Whitman's intent was to save Oregon or a part of it; that he did do it; that there was danger of its being traded to England; that the story was known long previous to its publication in the Sacramento Union in 1864; that Dr. Whitman did much to promote the emigration of 1843; and that his leading that emigration through was a most important event in saving Oregon.

I. *A discussion of some points in the publications of these writers which affect their reliability and that of their arguments.*

(a) *A criticism of some of the expressions which they use as arguments.* Prof. Bourne uses the following: "deceptive confirmation," referring to Dr. C. Eells' letter of 1866 (p 26); "fictitious interviews" with Webster and Tyler (26); "frenzied statement" (27), and "hodge podge" (30) referring to Mr. Spalding's pamphlet; "*rehash* of Spalding and Gray overladen with much irrelevant disquisition" (41); "such *turbid* sources" as Spalding and Gray (40); "intermingling inextricably perversions of fact with pure fictions, and enormously distorting the history" of Oregon, referring to Barrows's Oregon (40); "specious apologetics" and his "superficial and disingenuous method," referring to Dr. Craighead's book (45-46); "untrustworthy as history," referring to Dr. Nixon's book (47); "the advocate and not the historian," referring to Dr. Mowry (50); "flimsy evidence" (50); "constantly garbles and interpolates his quotations," referring to Mr. Spalding (61); "vindictiveness" of Mr. Spalding (64); "Spalding's fauxpas" (65); "Dr. Craighead has the hardihood to write" (78); "stamp or hall mark" of Spalding's invention (82); "fallaciously summarized" by Myron Eells (96); "imaginative perversion" of Barrows (195).

Similarly Prof. Marshall writes "totally worthless book" and "throwing together his Oregon," "never in any proper sense written," referring to Dr. Barrows's book (222); the "fool friends of Dr.

Whitman," referring to Messrs. Barrows, Nixon, Craighead, M. Eells, Laurie, Mowry and Edwards (291); "small souled and narrow minded folly" (291); "not above a third or fourth rate man," referring to Dr. Whitman (232); "fabrications of alleged authorities" (234). Was it strange that Professor Fiske wrote him, "I think the force of your arguments would be enhanced if your style of expression were now and then a little less vehement?" (230).

But in this they only follow the man whom they so much admire and quote, Hon. Elwood Evans, who in 1885 used these expressions "false claim," "falsehood," "unmitigated falsehood," "glaringly false statement," "venerable gentlemen . . . . who for the nonce doffed their saintly calling," "so called reverends," "doughty champions," "melange of absurdity, nonsense, fiction and falsehood," "reverend champions of a fable," "baseless fabrications," "interject his extravaganza," "wriggling policy of the Eells," "slanders of the dead," "Gulliver, Munchausen and Quixote."*

Another person whom Prof. Bourne quotes, P. W. Gillette (106-110), calls the statements that have been used to convince people that Dr. Whitman saved Oregon, "fulsome stuff and stupid lies."*

Bancroft also uses similar language, calling W. H. Gray, "the Great untruthful and whilom mission builder."*

Now every time that these writers use the word fiction, fable, legend, fictitious, and the like in

---

*Oregonian of March 20 and May 21, 1885.

*Oregonian, February 26, 1900.

*Bancroft, Hist. Northwest Coast, Vol. 2., p. 537.

regard to the story, do they not beg the question? for the very question under discussion is whether the story is a legend or true. Calling it false does not make it so. If a man has a case in court in which his neighbor is charged with stealing, is it proper for him to call him a thief until it is so decided by the court, and if he is a gentleman will he do so? He may say he believes him to be a thief, but to say that he is one before the court decides it to be so is simply begging the question. And in this case, to the writer it seems that if these persons were simply to say that they believe the story to be a legend or fiction, it would be far more the part of gentlemanly historians than to say that it is so and call names, while the question is under discussion.

At least the writer acknowledges that he shall not try to cope with the professors and honorable gentlemen in such arguments. They remind him however of a statement said to have been made by Dr. Lyman Beecher, that when in preaching he had the least to say, he hulloaed the loudest. In the same article in which Gov. Evans used his he said, "I aspire to no sanctity of character. I am not a church man nor had I ever the benefit of a Sunday school training." Whether the other persons can excuse themselves on the same ground the writer cannot say. He prefers to follow the advice of Prof. Fiske to Prof. Marshall, "It seems to me that there is great value in a quiet form of statement, even approaching to understatement, for it gives the reader a chance to do a little swearing at the enemy on his own account."*

*Prof. Marshall's Pamphlet, p. 230.

(b) *The use oftentimes of the word "probably" and its synonyms as an argument.* In this too Prof. Bourne follows his predecessors of whom he speaks so highly, Elwood Evans, and Mrs. F. F. Victor. Gov. Evans said that it was most *improbable* that Dr. Whitman asked the approval of his fellow workers on a journey to save Oregon, that it was *improbable* that he pledged the President that he would show that Oregon was accessible by wagons or that the President promised to await the result. When Gov. A. Ramsey of Minnesota stated that he saw Dr. Whitman in Washington in 1843, Gov. Evans thought that he *probably* saw Rev. Jason Lee, who was there in 1844, and Mrs. Victor thought he *probably* saw Dr. E. White who was there in 1842.

Prof. Bourne says that the other witnesses besides Mr. Spalding *probably* derived other features of their evidence from him (8); that Dr. Atkinson *could hardly* have escaped knowledge of the story had it been known in Oregon before 1865* (18); that if Anson Dart had heard of it from Mr. Walker he could *hardly* have failed to note it in his general report (19); that one is led to the intrinsically *probable* conclusion that Amant derived certain of his knowledge from the Catholic missionaries (22); Dr. Barrows *seems* to have withstood the temptation to consult the letters of the Oregon missionaries in Boston (40); the reader will not *easily avoid* the conclusion

*Dr. Atkinson says that for some years before 1865 it had been in his mind as a great historical fact. Oregonian, May 21, 1885.

that P. B. Whitman consulted Gray's History to refresh his memory (66); the story that any incident occurred at Fort Walla Walla in 1842 that affected Dr. Whitman's departure *could not* have been true, because Rev. C. Eells did not hear of it* (73); it is *probable* that after forty years John Tyler, jr.'s recollection of Whitman was more or less affected by Barrow's narratives (81); it is *nearly certain* that John Tyler saw Dr. White in Washington and not Dr. Whitman (81); "it is *probable* that some of Dr. White's speeches to promote the emigration in 1842, reached the elder Zachary," instead of anything from Dr. Whitman (although the younger Zachary said that it was because of the representations of Dr. Whitman) (95); that Mrs. Carey, who said that she came to Oregon because of a pamphlet written by Dr. Whitman was *presumably* a young girl.* (96). At last however Professor Bourne drops all probablys and says

"the recollections of those who were children or youth in 1843 that their parents were influenced by Whitman's articles or pamphlets all refer to Dr. White's efforts in 1842" (96);

which is as much as to say "I know better than any of you what caused your parents to go to Oregon,

---

*Mr. Eells lived 175 miles from there and was not there again for a long time.

*The writer obtained this evidence from Mrs. Carey and it is the first time he ever heard that she was a young girl in 1843. It is a supposition of Prof. Bourne, based on no evidence.

although I never saw your parents or Dr. Whitman or Dr. White, or lived in Oregon."

"I feel pretty certain that the speech [of the Indians at St. Louis in 1833] was invented by Mr. Spaulding" (105).

These are all written by a man who denies statements of witnesses made from twenty-five to forty years after the events took place, because they are not scientific. They remind the writer of a book entitled "Historic Doubts as to Napoleon Bonaparte." It was intended as a satire on the doubts which some have expressed as to the works and existence of Christ. In it the attempt is made to show that many of the acts which it was claimed that Napoleon did were very improbable and that those who testified about them were deceived, mistaken or unreliable, and from such reasoning we may conclude that it is not probable that Napoleon ever lived. Now it is not denied that Napoleon did many improbable things, yet the world will believe that he lived and did them, and will not be led to believe the contrary because of the improbability of his acts.

(c) Twice Professor Bourne refers to the "crushing attack" of Mrs. Victor and Elwood Evans in 1884-5 (36, 45). How crushing it was may be seen from the Professor's own statements, for he speaks of "the survival if not victory of the fiction" (36); and after speaking of the controversy of that time quotes a sentence written by M. Eells, "We felt that we had gained the victory". Prof. Bourne adds, "The feeling was justified by the event. The real

spread of the legend, its acceptance by scholars of reputation, dates from the period of this controversy" (40). He refers to over thirty books which adopted it; to many newspapers who spread it before hundreds of thousands of readers; to the fact that hundreds of pulpits proclaimed it; and that at the vote in 1900 as to whose names should be inscribed on the Hall of Fame, Dr. Whitman received eighteen out of a possible ninety-eight votes, as one of the greatest Americans, ranking equally with W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and James Monroe, and surpassing Chief Justice Taney, T. Benton, S. P. Chase and Winfield Scott.

Again he says (42)

"The result has been that more people know of the fictitious history than the true facts;"

and adds

"Whether the stream can be returned to its own channel and the history of the Oregon question be restored to its original outlines as they existed before 1865 is open to question"; (53).

and

"to judge from the past the prophecy of Rev. W. Barrows in 1883, and the modest proposal of J. Wilder Fairbank in 1901, are quite as likely to attain realization, as the vox clamantis of criticism is to get a respectful hearing" (54).

Such was the result of the *crushing* attack by Mrs. Victor and Elwood Evans, ac-

cording to Prof. Bourne. Surely it was a *crushing* attack that did not crush. In fact it did not wholly crush Prof. Bourne. On page 104 he gives a summary of Mr. Evans' conclusions in 1884 in which are five points, and the Professor fully disagrees with Mr. Evans in regard to two of them, namely, that there is no evidence that Dr. Whitman visited Washington City during the Spring of 1843; and that his exclusive purpose was to secure the rescinding by the American Board of Foreign Missions of the order of 1841 to abandon the southern stations of Wai-i-lat-pu and Lapwai, for Prof. Bourne says "his business in Washington was to urge government measures to make emigration to Oregon easier and safer" (99).

(d) *Certain strange statements of these writers.* Prof. Bourne (27), Prof. Marshall (227), and Elwood Evans in the Tacoma Ledger of January 16, 1885, say that the reason of the invention of the legend (as they call it) was that according to treaty, the Hudson's Bay company were to receive pay for their property in Oregon, that they claimed over five million dollars (only however receiving $650,000) and it made the American Board or its missionary angry to think that that company was getting so much while the American Board was receiving nothing for all it had done and lost. Only Prof. Bourne refers to any authority for this. He refers to Mr. Spalding's Executive Document, pp. 56-59, 70, 78-80. Having examined this the writer finds no mention made in regard to the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company whatever, much less of this being the reason of Mr.

Spalding writing the story. As a resident of the Pacific coast for over fifty years, intimately acquainted with the old missionaries, son of the one who held the power of attorney for the American Board in regard to its claims on the Pacific Coast, he can say that he never heard of the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company having anything to do in the remotest degree with the claim that Dr. Whitman saved Oregon, except from these gentlemen, and would request them to prove it, and to prove it better than by referring to an old pamphlet, of which but few are in existence to which anyone can refer, but which contains nothing to support the assertion.

But like the false witnesses who appeared to give evidence against Christ at his trial before the high priest, whose "witness agreed not together," so it is in the present case. Prof. Bourne says that it was Mr. Spalding who invented the legend, angry at the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company, while Mr. Evans says that it was Rev. S. B. Treat, D. D., Secretary of the American Board, or the "Great Treat" as he calls him, and plainly states that he does not believe it was Mr. Spalding; that Dr. Treat then sent to the Oregon missionaries to verify it, and "they rushed hastily to the front, without regard to rhyme or reason, or consistencies of date or facts or circumstances to improve upon Treat's conception." But Prof. Bourne (54) maintains that the other witnesses to sustain the invention of Mr. Spalding agree so harmoniously that "every single extant version is a branch from that parent stem."

Again Prof. Bourne refers to Dr. Laurie who

says in regard to the order to discontinue the stations of Dr. Whitman and Mr. Spalding that he will not say how it was but will let Dr. Whitman speak for himself; after which Dr. Laurie quotes Dr. Whitman's letter. Prof. Bourne adds "Why Dr. Laurie refrains from saying 'how it was' will appear later" (38). But nowhere afterwards can the writer find any reference to this or Dr. Laurie.

Likewise in regard to the evidence of Messrs. Geiger, C. Eells, P. B. Whitman, Hinman, Parker and Mrs. E. Walker, Prof. Bourne says that it will be examined in connection with that of Messrs. Gray and Spalding, but nowhere can be found any such examination of any of the last three (37).

Again "Greenhow's exhaustive history was being distributed as a public document" early in 1843 (85), but (80) he says, Greenhow's Preface was "dated February 1844."*

He writes that for Dr. J. R. Wilson to say that Saint de Amant declared his belief that Whitman was instrumental in saving a valuable portion of the Northwest to the United States is deceptive (21), but gives Amant's writing which says that "Dr. Whitman became a very active agent of the American interests and contributed in no small degree to promote annexation" (106). Again he says that for President Penrose to use the words of Eells and Spalding in translating Amant to prove that he was familiar

*The fact was that the preface was thus dated, and the book published in 1845, but a smaller edition of less than half the size, not the exhaustive history, had been circulated as a public document.

with their contentions, i. e., of the missionaries, would not be defensible in a trained scholar (22). But the sentence even as translated, which was never called a literal translation, was not used to prove that Amant was familiar with their contentions, but that the story did not originate with Mr. Spalding about 1865.

Further he says, "The original account of Whitman's journey, its causes, purpose and results was first published in a series of articles in the Pacific . . . . in the fall of 1865" (8); while (101) he refers to "the earliest printed version of Whitman's political services, in behalf of Oregon, published in the Sacramento Union, Nov. 16, 1864."

He states the position of Elwood Evans who says that Dr. Whitman's "exclusive purpose was to have the Board rescind the order to abandon Lapwai and Wai-i-lat-pu" (38), and says that this was "solidly established" by Mr. Evans (39). Prof. Bourne says also that this was his real purpose (55). But afterwards he says that before Dr. Whitman left Oregon he contemplated going to Washington according to the statements of Mrs. Whitman and Dr. White (75), and the reason of this was that "if emigration on a grand scale was to begin the government ought to protect it and establish supply stations" (99-100). Nearly half a page is filled with a description of his work in regard to this (77-8). The writer has been somewhat troubled to learn exactly Prof. Bourne's position on this point, but from what he can gather is inclined to the opinion that if the Professor were asked if he thought that Dr. Whitman's exclusive

purpose for going east was to save the mission he would say, yes; but on being further questioned would say, that the Doctor also intended before leaving his home to go to Washington for the above mentioned purpose. The writer however will not try to reconcile these two answers.

In reply to a statement of Mr. Spalding that Dr. Whitman reached Washington March 3 before the adjournment of Congress, Prof. Bourne says that the Doctor was at Westport, Mo., February 15, three hundred miles west of St. Louis and that it was "almost if not quite impossible for him to have reached Washington in fifteen days" (86). When answering the question why the Doctor went to Washington before he went to Boston, he says that "his plan for protecting and aiding emigration might be seriously diminished by a few days delay after the adjournment of congress" (99).

Prof. Bourne condemns Barrows because in his book he rejects the fable of Sir George Simpson being in Washington "with engaging candor, only to insert it five times within fifty pages," "cf. pp. 233, with pp. 153, 158, 202, 203, 204" (40). Now Barrows says "If Sir George Simpson ever visited Washington, the evidence is yet wanting except in rumors" (233). But on p. 153 he writes that Gov. Simpson "*is said* about that time to have enjoyed protracted social relations at Washington with D. Webster;" and on page 158 he quotes what Mr. Spalding said about Gov. Simpson's work at Washington; and on pages 202-4 in one discussion he tells what was reported about Gov.

Simpson, and his work in Washington. The fact is he does not reject it and then insert it five times, but simply says that the evidence about Gov. Simpson being there is wanting except in rumors, and then inserts the rumors three times on five different pages between pages 153 and 204. Now the question may be properly asked: Is that fair treatment of an opponent who is dead and cannot answer for himself, by a candid historian?

Prof. Marshall likewise makes similarly strange statements. He says that S. A. Clarke wrote an account of Dr. Whitman's trip east and the national reasons for it in 1864 in which he says that it was "an incident of our early history never *to my knowledge* before given to the public" (232). Afterwards Prof. Marshall says the above mentioned correspondence "explicitly declared that it had never before been given to the public" (234), omitting the words "to my knowledge." Whether it had previously been thus given depends somewhat on what is understood by the words "given to the public." If they mean, "first printed" it is the first time as far as we yet know. If in a public address they could be thus given, then according to Mrs. G. F. Colbert, of Crawfordsville, Oregon, she heard it in a sermon by Mr. Spalding about 1852.* Prof. Marshall delivered an address on this Whitman subject seventeen years ago last November in Baltimore. If that was making his views public, then he is mistaken when he says what

*Oregonian, May 21, 1885.

he has, as just quoted, while Mr. Clarke was correct. Certainly it was a serious mistake to make Mr. Clarke say what he did not say.

Again, January 13, 1902, Prof. Marshall wrote the author in regard to Mr. Spalding's diary which he has. The Professor says:

"You have professed for a number of years to be anxious to have the truth appear in this matter. If sincere in that profession, why do you not publish the diary of Rev. H. H. Spaulding, which I understand is in your possession, or turn it over, unmutilated, to the Oregon Historical Society, where historical students can get access to it. That diary must contain a good deal of matter that would be very important in a discussion of the Whitman question, and, so far as I have been able to learn, except 61 words printed by you on page 18 of your pamphlet, "Marcus Whitman, M. D.", you have not published a solitary word from that diary, which is the most convincing proof that there is nothing in it that supports the Saving Oregon theory of Whitman's ride. It is precisely this policy of concealment of evidence which has caused me to make my criticism of the leading advocates of the myth very severe. I do not think that it is at all necessary now for the establishment of the truth in this matter that you should make Spalding's diary accessible, but I do think it is indispensable to your reputation for candor and good faith that you should do this, and you should have done it as soon as it came into your possession."

As previously the writer has been asked in regard to evidence from this diary, he will say that the diary does not include the time under discussion, and that the writer did a few years ago, copy by hand and turn over to Prof. F. G. Young, Secretary of the Oregon Historical Society, all that was of public interest. The journal covers 87 pages, ten and a half inches by

fourteen and a half, and is in a blank book. It is quite full from November 1838, to April 22, 1842. Then there are ten and a half blank pages, as if he was too busy then to write in it, but intended to do so when he should have more time; then there is a page and a half from February 21 to March 7, 1843, and that is the end. It is doubtful whether he kept any more diary anywhere, at least while he was in the mission, as there is then a blank page and a half, after which are sixteen pages of lists of subscribers to the American Messenger, Child's Paper, and others, after 1852, when he was in the Willamette valley. That is all there is in the book. The readers can judge from this on what little evidence and knowledge the Professor bases some of his statements.

Again he writes (23,) that so many people had written about this subject *without knowing anything about the facts,* as Messrs. Barrows, Nixon, Craighead, M. Eells, Laurie, Mowry and Edwards had done, that he thought one man ought to have the patience to wait until he had thoroughly mastered it before rushing into print about it, but that he is now ready to publish the final word about it. In 1888 (222) twelve years before the time just spoken of as "now" he knew that if its falsity were not exposed it would soon be in the school histories and tried to prevent it by offering to read a paper about it before the Historical Association, but failed; afterwards he found it going into these histories (229) which was most certainly through the arguments of these persons who knew nothing about the facts; and so he con-

cluded that the best thing he could do was to drive the story from the school books, not by a public discussion, where scholars could read both sides, but by writing privately to the authors of these books. He also says (222) that he was for fifteen years previous to December, 1900, the only one—"the solitary voice"—east of the Rocky mountains who cried out against this historical fabrication.

Now what do these statements and this evidence show? Is not the following the natural answer? That Mr. Marshall knew of the public discussion on the Pacific coast; that he knew that his side had been worsted by those who knew "not anything about the facts" so that he was the only one to defend his side east of the Rockies, while those who believed the evidence presented by those who knew nothing, absolutely nothing, were a great number; hence he was afraid to meet his opponents who knew nothing in argument, and concluded about two years before Prof. Bourne read his paper to write to the authors of histories so quietly that his opponents would not know it, and so could not answer him. How much he wrote, the writer does not know, but to Dr. Mowry he wrote a letter of 182 pages before the latter published his book, but failed to convince him, for he had studied both sides of the subject.* In this letter he practically characterized the defenders of Dr. Whitman, as Messrs. Atkinson, Barrows, Gray, Spalding, C. Eells and M. Eells, as liars. Thus secretly he took opportunity to speak to authors in such a

*Letter of Dr. W. A. Mowry to the author.

way that the above named persons could defend neither themselves nor their side of the question. Was it not a blow in the dark?

(3) Elwood Evans, too, properly falls under this criticism. In 1883 Dr. C. Eells had stated in regard to the meeting of the mission held in September 1842, that a record of it was made, but that

"the book containing the same was in the keeping of the Whitman family. At the time of their massacre, November 29, 1847, it disappeared."

The house of Dr. Eells at the Whitman mission was burned in 1872, a fact which Mr. Evans knew. He had also been furnished with a pamphlet containing the above statement of Dr. Eells. Yet in 1884 he wrote;

"In 1866 Rev. Cushing Eells had in his possession the minutes of all the missionary meetings. The assertion that those records were destroyed by fire in 1872, will not be accepted as a satisfactory excuse that between 1865 and 1872 those minutes were not appealed to, to settle the question of what transpired at the mission meeting of 1842."*

Gov. P. H. Burnett published in 1880 that

"On the 18th of May [1843] the emigrants met at the rendezvous, held a meeting and appointed a committee to see Dr. Whitman"

and he adds that on the 20th at a meeting at the Big

*Oregonian, Dec. 26, 1884.

Springs he met the Doctor. This he took from a concise journal he kept.* Mr. Evans wrote

"Dr. Whitman's connection with that immigration commenced with the crossing of the North Platte in June."*

Mr. Evans wrote that cotemporary history establishes the fact that Rev. Jason Lee was in Washington during the winter of 1843-4. Cotemporary history established the fact that he did not leave the Sandwich Islands for the east until February 28, 1844, and sailed in a small schooner to Mexico, which he crossed.* Later history states that he reached New York May 27, and afterwards went to Washington, being there the last half of June.*

Mr. Evans wrote that Daniel Webster said in his speech March 30, 1846.

"The government of the United States never offered any line south of 49 degrees (with the navigation of the Columbia) and it never will. It behooves all concerned to regard this as a settled point. I said as plainly as I could speak or put down words in writing, that England must not expect anything south of forty-nine degrees. I said so in so many words."*

The first two sentences are in that speech. Afterwards when questioned, he added in regard to what he had just told the Senate, not England, in 1842,

---

*Recollections of an Old Pioneer, p. 101.
*Oregonian, Dec. 26, 1884.
*Hines, Oregon, chap. 10.
*Hines, Missionary History of the Pacific Northwest, p. 305-6.
*Oregonian, March 20, 1885.

"the senator and the senate will do me the justice to admit that I said as plainly as I could and in as short sentence as I could frame that England must not expect anything south of the forty-ninth degree,"*

except that there might be friendly negotiation about the navigation of the Columbia, and about certain straits, sounds and islands in the neighboring seas. Mr. Evans's quotation is a strange mixture, and the words "put down words in writing" were not then used by Webster.

(4) Mrs. F. F. Victor is also another person whose literary accuracy Prof. Bourne honors. She wrote that the object of Gov. Simpson's journey around the world in 1841-2 was "the study of the fur trade and not politics." Gov. Simpson did study the fur trade, but he also devoted a part of chapter six to the political situation of Oregon, declared that England needed no more arguments to support her claims than she had, and challenged the Americans to impose "the Atlantic tariff on the ports of the Pacific."*

Mrs. Victor wrote that "the first suggestion of a safe and easy road to the Columbia river" through the Blue mountains, "came from a member of the Hudson's Bay Company" and referred to T. J. Farnham's book as proof.* But Farnham, although speaking of such a road wrote as he did after his visit to Dr. Whitman's in 1839, and does not refer to the

*Webster's Works, Vol. 5, pp. 73, 76, 77.
*Simpson's Journey round the world, pp. 149-153.
*Oregonian, Nov. 7, 1884.

Hudson's Bay Company anywhere as his authority on the subject. Mr. Farnham was an "Ardent American."

Dr. Cushing Eells had said that Dr. Whitman had a "cherished object" in going east, referring to the saving of the mission, but he did not remember that it was mentioned at the meeting of the mission in September, 1842.* Mrs. Victor claimed that Dr. Whitman had a "secret motive" known to Dr. Eells, but not mentioned, and thinks that it was to obtain an office for himself, i. e., Dr. Whitman, in Oregon.*

She again wrote, "Admitting that he (Dr. Whitman) feared the treaty of boundary would draw the line at the Columbia river, leaving him in British territory, could he hope to reach Washington before it was concluded."* But such a line would not have left Dr. Whitman's station in British territory as any map of the state of Washington will show, and Mrs. Victor had visited the Whitman mission station before she wrote this.

Referring to the Doctor's visit to Boston, she speaks of his cold reception by the Board but adds that they "did finally consent to permit the Doctor to continue the mission work there begun, should he wish to do so, without further help from them."* Not only is there nowhere any evidence of this statement but the Board sustained him and his mission to the day of his death.

---

*Eells' Whitman pamphlet, p. 10.

*Oregonian, Nov. 7, 1884.

*Oregonian, Nov. 7, 1884.

*Bancroft, Oregon, p. 243.

Bancroft's history is spoken of by Prof. Bourne as a "great achievement," (41) and while he does not think it perfect, yet he praises it highly as well as Mrs. Victor, the avowed author of Bancroft's Oregon. "The Proceeding of the Society of California Pioneers in reference to the Histories of Hubert Howe Bancroft," a pamphlet of thirty-seven pages published in Feburary, 1894, is an answer to this. Mr. Bancroft was an honorary member of the Society. In October, 1893, charges were made against his histories, especially those of his own state, California, but references are made to other works of his, including the history of Oregon. Some of his statements were charged with being "at variance with historical records," "unworthy the labors of an upright historian," and as the statements of one "who had strayed far from the domain of an honest writer." His name was by vote accordingly stricken from the roll. At the next meeting of the Society this was reconsidered in order to give Mr. Bancroft an opportunity to defend himself and a committee was appointed to take the matter in charge. Seven counts were prepared against him, to sustain which his books were the witnesses. In these counts he was charged with having distorted the facts and truths of history," "maligned the memory of many of the men" conspicuous in early events, called those liars who disagreed with him as the briefest way of disposing of their narratives, especially those who were dead and could make no answer, and of having a spirit of prejudice and seemingly malignant dislikes and hatreds of the men about whom he had written.

A single illustration is here given from what was prepared for the history of Oregon, and printed, but finally stricken out and a new page printed in its place because of the earnest intercession of some who had become acquainted with the fact. It is in regard to President Grant, at one time an officer of the army in Oregon and an honorary member of the California Society. "Among these soldiers was U. S. Grant, a man of mediocre abilities, and somewhat loose habits, subsequently elevated by accident to the head of the army, and twice to the presidency of the United States. Not satisfied to rest with the world's highest honors, he turned and took a downward course; asked again to be president, was refused; begged from poor Mexico important concessions and was refused; and finally engaged in a business which was disreputably managed and resulted in ignominious failure. So the end of the man was as bad as the beginning."

Judge O. C. Pratt, who tried the murderers of Dr. Whitman, also received a severe blow in the History of Oregon.

Mr. Bancroft was requested to appear before a committee of the Society and answer the charges. He failed to appear, and another time was set when he also failed to appear. A third time was set, which he likewise ignored, whereupon, February 5, 1894, when eighty members of the Society were present, his name was unanimously stricken from the roll of honorary membership of the Society.

Is it now proper to ask the question whether persons who make such statements with such styles

of argumentation and using such expressions are candid, honest, fair, careful, scientific historians?

This subject is a matter of history and the writer cannot see why anyone on either side should try to decide it by calling names, dealing in probabilities, or misstating an opponent's position. The question is simply to be decided by weight of argument. There are two sides to the question. People may differ honestly in regard to the relative weight of the arguments and facts, just as good Christian people differ in regard to the teaching of the Bible on questions of doctrine or church government, but the writer's opinion is that discussion should be conducted in a calm, rational manner. The writer has wondered if the above are indications of the way in which history is taught at Yale college.*

II. *Points in regard to which the writer agrees with Prof. Bourne.*

(a) That the mind of Rev. H. H. Spalding was affected by the Whitman massacre so that his statements are not always reliable.

Away from home at the time of the massacre and riding directly towards Dr. Whitman's mission immediately after his death, Mr. Spalding learned of the massacre when within three miles of the station. Consequently he turned and fled and by a roundabout journey reached his home, after a week's travel,

*See above, p. 3, foot note.

having been on foot most of the time traveling by night, with almost no food except the roots and berries he could gather, with feet bleeding for want of shoes, followed a part of the way by an Indian who wanted to kill him, knowing that his daughter was among the captives or killed and that the murderers had threatened to go to his station and kill his family. He thus underwent physical and mental sufferings which would have killed many men, and if his mind on some points had been affected ever afterwards, it would not have been strange. Yet notwithstanding the expressions which Prof. Bourne quotes about him as having been "a poor broken down wreck," "not over and above sane on any subject," and the like, he lived twenty-four years after this and did more good, especially to the Nez Perce Indians than a great share of mankind do anywhere in a lifetime. Still we agree with the Professor that Mr. Spalding's statements are not always reliable *when not accompanied with other evidence.*

(b) Again the writer agrees with the Professor that a certain event at old Fort Walla Walla, October 2, 1842, was not the *prime cause* of Dr. Whitman's going east, when before a large number of traders and chief factors it was said that the Canadian express had arrived, bringing the news that the Red river emigration from Manitoba was over the mountains, and so Oregon was safe to England. For the Oregon mission had by vote on September 28 authorized the Doctor to go east four days before this incident is said to have happened.

(c) The writer also agrees that those statements could not have been made as quoted, for the Red River emigration came in 1841, and the Canadian express did not reach Fort Walla Walla in 1842 until October 22.

(d) Again the writer agrees that Dr. Whitman did not originate the whole emigration of 1843, for the testimony of some of the emigrants says that they did not start because of any representations of the Doctor.

(e) The writer lastly agrees that two reasons why the Doctor went east were to secure the rescinding of the order of the Board to discontinue his station and that of Mr. Spalding, and also to obtain a number of Christian families to settle near the mission stations so as to set the Indians a good example and to take much of the secular work from the missionaries. The Professor need not have searched the records of the Board to have established these facts, as they were published in the Missionary Herald in September, 1843, have never been denied by the writer and have not been the subject of real controversy for over fifteen years on the Pacific coast. In fact all of these points were published by the writer in 1883 and have not been the subject of much controversy for many years.

III. But while the writer willingly agrees with Professor Bourne on these points, he *decidedly disagrees* with him on others, namely:

(a) That because Mr. Spalding and one or two others have made mistakes in their statements, the whole story is a legend, no weight being given to any other statements. To illustrate, a murder was committed at Port Townsend in this state several years ago among a crowd of people. In court some of the witnesses on oath testified that it was done before a certain event took place which all saw, and some testified that it was done after this event. Some witnesses were mistaken, yet this did not prove that there was no murder. So now while there are some mistakes in the evidence, they neither prove that Dr. Whitman did not go east with intent to help the country politically, nor that he accomplished nothing while there.

Another illustration of this principle occurs in this discussion. In 1883 the writer published in a pamphlet some remarks on the subject made in the Oregon legislature, taken from the Danville Advertiser of New York, which he said copied them from the Sacramento Bulletin. The writer was mistaken in saying they were copied from the Sacramento Bulletin, for they were copied from the Sacramento Union. Both Prof. Bourne and Prof. Marshall have referred to this mistake, the only mistake they have found by the writer in this controversy. The writer's excuse is that in the manuscript copy which he has of that article it is said to have been taken from the Bul-

letin. It was a mistake of the copyist. But this mistake does not prove that the article was not published in Danville or Sacramento. Prof. Marshall even says that because of this mistake he "supposed this to be merely another of the numerous fabrications of alleged authorities and so did not try to trace it up" until after the meeting of the American Historical Association in December, 1900, although he had known what the author wrote since 1885. He found however that the position here taken by the writer is true, that there might be some mistake in regard to a statement and yet that in the main the statement might be correct. In fact, if this were not so the Professor would have to yield his whole argument in regard to the Whitman story, for he says that "we know not only the author but the very date and place of its first appearance," "full grown," the author having been Mr. Spalding and the date and place the San Francisco Pacific of October 19, and November 9, 1865 (227); but (232) he acknowledges that it appeared in the Sacramento Union November 16, 1864, and was known by S. A. Clarke and in the Oregon legislature a little before that.

Here is where Professor Bourne and some other persons have made a serious mistake. They have set up all of Mr. Spalding's statements, (having concluded to reject all others that were contaminated by contact with him) have battered down some of these statements, and then have concluded that they have swept away the whole story, either not knowing or forgetting that other statements are supported by a

large amount of other evidence and also that the writer published these mistakes as mistakes in 1883.

(b) The writer does not agree with Professor Bourne that the two reasons given above were the main reasons for the Doctor's going east, largely because so little was written at the time about his political reasons while so much was written about the two missionary reasons.

To illustrate again from the writer's experience. In February, 1881 the writer went about a hundred miles to perform a marriage ceremony between two white persons. While thus absent he preached both to whites and Indians, attended two funerals, assisted in holding an Indian court, did some trading for himself, more for others, did some work on the United States census, selected a cemetery, recorded a town plat, saw to the signing of nineteen deeds which required 138 signatures, obtained two marriage licenses for Indians and married the two couples, did pastoral work and talked about these things very much more than he did about that wedding of white people, (in fact said as little as possible about that except to a few trusted friends). And yet the fact remains that he would not have made the trip at that time had it not been for that wedding, though he would have gone two or three months later. So Dr. Whitman could have gone east for several objects. Because he and others talked and wrote more about mission work is no proof that this was the main reason he went, though others as well as Professor Bourne have written much to prove that it was and some have

asserted that it was the only object he had in view.

Although Professor Bourne makes much of this want of evidence at the missionary rooms at Boston, in Mrs. Whitman's letters, and in other writings that Dr. Whitman went east for national reasons, as a strong proof that he had no such reasons, it reminds the writer of the story of the five witnesses in court who testified that they saw the prisoner murder his fellow being, but because ten men appeared who stated that they did not see the murder committed the prisoner was cleared. A curious illustration of Professor Bourne's reasoning is his reference to Mr. Spalding's interview with Joel Palmer, September 17, 1845, and a letter of Mr. Spalding's to General Palmer April 7, 1846 (18). As Mr. Spalding mentioned nothing to General Palmer then about Dr. Whitman saving Oregon, Professor Bourne's conclusion is that he knew nothing about Dr. Whitman going east for national purposes. The fact was that Oregon was not fully saved, as the Oregon treaty was not made until June, 1846.

Another illustration of Professor Bourne's reasoning is the statement that because "such representative newspapers as Niles' Register and the N. Y. Tribune" did not hint that Lord Ashburton was likely to take up the Oregon question, therefore he did not discuss it. This will be considered a little later*

In fact the author does not think that Professor Bourne really believes in this principle, for if he does he has made a statement damaging to himself. He

*See pp. 44-5.

says that Dr. Whitman's business in Washington was to urge the government to make emigration to Oregon easier and safer. Yet he does not find a particle of evidence in the missionary rooms at Boston that the Doctor was in Washington or was urging such measures. Neither can he find it from Mr. Spalding's interview with General Palmer or the letters of Dr. C. Eells or Dr. Atkinson or Mr. Walker or Mr. Spalding before 1864, or from any of Mrs. Whitman's letters. He can find from her letters that before the Doctor started east he intended to go to Washington but she nowhere states in those letters which have been found, as far as the writer knows, that he went there or urged government to take such measures. Yet notwithstanding the lack of such evidence in these places where it might be supposed that it ought to be, Professor Bourne states that Dr. Whitman did go to Washington for that purpose. This is the author's answer to the charges made that his side has not quoted "perfectly accessible sources" which Professor Bourne says "demonstrate its falsity" (6) but which the author claims do not because they simply say nothing on the subject. If Professor Bourne can find a plain statement at Boston or in Mrs. Whitman's letters or by any good authority previous to 1864 that Dr. Whitman did not go east for national reasons, let him make it known, but if not, the absence of evidence in certain places is not conclusive proof that Dr. Whitman did not go east for those reasons.

(c) Professor Bourne holds that the recollections of persons who were acquainted with Dr. Whit-

man are of little or no value, when stated many years afterwards, if they are unsupported by written cotemporary evidence, for it is not scientific history. He rejects the evidence of many witnesses because they published nothing until 1864, and so the evidence depends on the memories of persons twenty-one years or more after the events took place. He refers (p. 71) to two books, "Introduction to the Study of History," and "Pierce's Recollections as a Source of History," to sustain him in his position. This address, delivered in June, 1901, was offered to the American Historical Review for publication, but was declined in a very gentlemanly letter by the editor in chief because "it rests largely on the remembrance of the old." He also added, "Scientific historical students know from innumerable tested cases that extremely little confidence can be reposed in recollections set down long after the events, *even when several of them closely agree.*"

If the editor had lived as long on the Pacific coast as he has on the Atlantic he would have learned that one great object of the State Historical Societies is to write down the historical statements of many individuals before they shall die and their knowledge be lost forever. There have been many men on the Pacific coast who never had much education and who find it a great task to write a little, who have made and witnessed the making of a large amount of history, not knowing its importance at the time, and even others did not realize it until later events showed the importance of these facts. These

societies are glad to record their evidence from thirty to sixty years after the events transpired. The writer has been asked to write a history of a part of the county in which he lives, and finds that until within twelve years there are almost no written records about it although it was settled forty-five years ago. The rest must be gathered from the recollections of early settlers. In fact can Professor Bourne tell what cotemporary writer recorded the history of Christ, all the gospels having been written many years after Christ's death? What cotemporary evidence is there for much of early Greek or Roman or English history which the Professor teaches, or much about the early life of Daniel Boone and the founders of Kentucky or other states? The writer has no objection to scientific history as above defined, namely the facts written at or near the time they occurred. He has tried to obtain all such scientific history that he could for all of his writings. He has searched old books, pamphlets and letters for it. He thinks highly of it, and more highly of only one thing and that is the truth. This he places above everything. Generally scientific history and truth agree, but sometimes in order to obtain the truth it is necessary to go outside of scientific history, and sometimes scientific history is not the truth. But to get as near the truth as possible is what the writer believes in thoroughly. If it cannot be done in this scientific way he does not believe in abandoning the attempt if it can be obtained in any other way. There is a true science and there has always been a "science falsely so called" since the time when Paul wrote about it

to Timothy. For instance Dr. Cushing Eells passed through two fires, one in 1840, and the other in 1872; also in 1848 he had to leave the Spokane country on account of the Whitman massacre and had to pack all he took with him on the backs of horses and mules. Some papers were burned in the first fire, others were lost by moving, and nearly all others by the second fire. Many persons after hearing him personally relate many of his pioneer experiences, were anxious to have them preserved. So he prepared a series of addresses on the subject, delivered them, and they were gladly published in the Walla Walla Watchman in 1885. Before his death his son Edwin wished to have more preserved and employed a stenographer to whom Dr. Eells related much and thus they were preserved. Although he refreshed his memory all he could from the writings of others, yet he had to rely on his memory for much. It was either this or to lose much of truth. In writing his biography the writer used the above material largely and still believes he did right. The truth of these statements has not been questioned by those who knew Dr. Eells.

The writer has in his library "Personal Recollections of General Nelson A. Miles," a book of 591 pages. Although undoubtedly General Miles used many notes of his own and of others, yet there is no doubt but that he drew on his memory for some of the book, and the writer does not believe it right to throw the book overboard because it is partly the personal recollection of the General.

Another book the writer prizes highly is "Pio-

neer days on Puget Sound," by Hon. A. A. Denney, one of the founders of Seattle, who went there in 1851. He lived in a log cabin for a time, where he did not have much opportunity to preserve early history, or indeed much idea of what its value would afterwards be. After he had been elected delegate to congress, had become one of Seattle's prominent bankers and substantial men of unquestioned integrity, and Seattle had grown to be the largest city in Washington, it was natural that his friends should wish to have him leave to them some of his knowledge. He did so in 1887, drawing on his memory for some of it. The truthfulness of the narrative has never been questioned to the writer's knowledge, and it will be a very sad day for the Northwest when all such recollections by its noble pioneers shall be rejected because they were recollections, and so not scientific.

In 1885-1886 the Oregonian published a long series of articles entitled "Pioneer Days," written by Hon. S. A. Clarke, who traversed Oregon and interviewed the old pioneers in order to obtain what was very difficult or impossible for them to write, and what would otherwise have been lost. Yet they depended largely on their memories for what they related. These articles the Oregonian paid for because it believed them to be very valuable.

If any scientific historian should have been married many years ago and then have passed through such a fire as that of Chicago in 1871, and should have lost the marriage certificate and likewise had the recorded one burned, the writer would not doubt

his marriage if the historian should state it from his personal memory, especially if it were confirmed by the statements of witnesses who were present at the marriage, even if that marriage had taken place forty years previous.

If a half dozen scientific historians had attended the same common school in early life taught by a certain teacher forty years ago, but if the school house should have been destroyed and the records all lost as has been the case with two schools which the writer attended more than forty years ago, and if they should meet this year and tell the name of the teacher and where the school house stood, the writer would accept it as historic truth even if Prof. Bourne should reject it because not scientific.

To illustrate from the present controversy. Previous to 1885 several of the friends of Dr. Whitman said that he told them that he went to Washington in 1843, and Governor Alexander Ramsey of Minnesota said he saw him there. Hon Elwood Evans disputed this and argued with all his powers of a lawyer against it, cross questioning Governor Ramsey on the subject. It was not scientific history, for the evidence was from memory. In 1891 a letter was found in Washington written by Dr. Whitman in which he said that he had been in Washington. This was scientific, but it was the truth just as much before that letter was found as after, and no more the truth afterward because of the finding of the letter.

Again Dr. C. Eells said from memory, thirty or forty years afterwards, that a meeting was held at

Dr. Whitman's by the Oregon mission which authorized Dr. Whitman to go east. Taking October 3d, Monday, as the day on which the Doctor started, Dr. Eells counted back what he did every day for the previous ten days and said that the meeting was begun September 26, 1842. This was not scientific but it was the truth. This was again controverted by Gov. Evans, who said there was no meeting of the Oregon mission held between the annual one in June and the time the Doctor started. In the Missionary Herald for September, 1843, it was stated by the editor that such a meeting was held, but he said that it was "last October." This was scientific but it was not the truth. Afterwards the journal of Rev. E. Walker was found of that time, and it stated exactly what Dr. Eells had said. This was scientific and it was the truth, but it was the truth just as surely before that journal was found. This discovery brought from Governor Evans a very humble letter of apology to S. T. Walker who had found his father's journal, and he also apologized to Dr. Eells in about the following words: "I did not impeach your integrity but I did your memory."

Again, as has been stated, several witnesses said from memory that Dr. Whitman told them that he went east in 1842-3 with other than missionary motives. This was not scientific but it was the truth, although for years it has been controverted, for a letter of his has been found in Boston which says, "It was to open a practical route and safe passage, and secure a favorable report of the journey from the

emigrants which in connection with other objects caused me to leave my family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey." Another letter has been found at Washington which states what he tried to do there before he went to Boston. This was just as much the truth before these letters were found as after.

On the other hand, in July, 1901, a pamphlet was published about Mason county, Washington, (the county in which the writer lives), for distribution at the Pan-American exposition at Buffalo, and which hence would be believed to be authentic. In this a statement is made about Martin Koopman (who lives in Hoodsport, six or eight miles from the writer's residence, and where the writer has preached constantly since 1888,) who, the pamphlet says "conducts a restaurant there." Now this is scientific because its author went there before he wrote it, took four pictures of the place for his pamphlet and was supposed to know. But the truth is that Mr. Koopman does not and never has kept a restaurant there but a saloon. Still if thirty years from now the history of Hoodsport shall be written and this shall be found, it will be accepted by scientific historians, even if ten residents of the place say from memory it is not so.

Again this pamphlet says of the same place that "the first white settler was Vincent Finch who came here in the early 60's," and "for many years this was the head of navigation and the only port on Hood canal." The truth is that Mr. Finch was not the first settler there, was not living there in the early 60's,

and the place was never the head of navigation or the only port on Hood canal, for Union City, four miles further up the canal, was a port about twenty years before Hoodsport dreamed of having a name. Now when such statements are made the only way to show them to be mistakes is to depend on the memories of those who have lived in the region for many years. But according to the scientific historians this is not to be accepted.

Still, as stated at first, the writer is willing to accept scientific history where it is truth; he will reject it when he knows that it is not; and he believes in trying to find the truth of history wherever it can be found. He half believes that the public will agree with him.

The reasoning of the editor of the Historical Review in regard to the little confidence to be placed on recollections set down long after the events, even when several of them closely agree, seems to be this: "some persons' memories have not been reliable, therefore none are; many coins are counterfeit, therefore all are; much beef was embalmed, therefore all was." Those on the Pacific coast who were acquainted with the witnesses mentioned in the Eells' Whitman pamphlet have never dared to reject all their testimony, though some who never knew them and have lived three or four thousand miles from them may do so.

But it seems as if Prof. Bourne did not believe the position he has thus taken, for he gives in support of his side three pages (106-109) containing inter-

views with Mrs. A. L. Lovejoy and D. P. Thompson, taken in 1899 or 1900, in which they tell what they remembered that Mr. Lovejoy told them about the affair under consideration. Mr. Thompson's interview was of what Mr. Lovejoy told him between early in the fifties and 1864, concerning what occurred in 1842-3:—a memory after from thirty-six to fifty years of another memory of from seven to twenty-one years, a total of fifty-seven years after the event. Yet if C. Eells or a number of other persons on the other side state what they remember from twenty-three to forty years after, it is said to be worthless. Can any other conclusion be reached than that Professor Bourne has decided that memory, even if it be a memory of a memory, fifty-seven years old, is of weight if on his side, but if it is on the other side and a single memory, not half as old, it is of no weight? Does this not break down his whole argument? The reader must decide whether it does not place him where he places Dr. Mowry, "an advocate and not a historian" (50).

(d) The writer does not agree that Daniel Webster and Lord Ashburton did not take up the Oregon question. Prof. Bourne says:

"Nor do such representative papers as Niles' Register and the N. Y. Tribune, in discussing Lord Ashburton's Mission, intimate that the Oregon boundary was likely to be taken up. See the issues of January 29, 1842. Lord Ashburton arrived April 3 and the next notice in Niles' Register is August 6. The Oregon emigration of 1842 left Independence, Mo., May 16." (68)

He inserts this to show that that emigration

could not have brought word to Dr. Whitman that there was danger of Oregon being traded off. It has already been referred to as a proof that absence of evidence in one place cannot be depended on to prove that a fact did not occur.* Elwood Evans took the same position, even asserting that

"the instructions of Lord Ashburton did not permit him to go to the Pacific. He had neither official power nor personal discretion on the Oregon question."*

In December, 1841, Lord Aberdeen, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, informed Edward Everett, U. S. Minister at London, that his

"government had determined to send Lord Ashburton as a special minister to the United States with full powers to settle the boundary question and all other questions in controversy between the two governments."

Lord Ashburton arrived in Washington, April 4, 1842. On April 11, 1842, Mr. Webster wrote Gov. Fairfield of Maine of Lord Ashburton's arrival, and that he was charged with full powers "to negotiate and settle different matters in discussion between the two governments."* As the emigrants left Independence May 16, forty-two days after Ashburton's arrival they could easily have learned of it, for Dr. Whitman went from Westport, Mo., to Washington

*See above, p. 34.

*Oregonian, March 20, 1885.

*Webster's Works, Vol. 6, pp. 270, 272, 273.

between Feb. 15 and March 28 via Ithaca, N. Y., in forty-one days, when Prof. Bourne says the Missouri river was frozen over. Moreover Lord Ashburton and Mr. Webster did discuss the Oregon boundary question, but found that there was so little probability of their coming to an agreement that it was omitted in the treaty for fear it would endanger other matters which were considered to be of more importance, and this was spoken of in the President's message the next December.

"Lord Ashburton had come over with specific and detailed instructions in regard to the northwestern as well as the northeastern boundary."*

(e) The following statement of Professor Bourne's is certainly incorrect. On page 289 he says

"that Dr. Whitman's visit dispelled ignorance about Oregon or inspired enthusiasm are equally without foundation. No doubt he could contribute some facts of interest but * * * * * Fremont was under commission to explore the Rockies; * * * * * and Sub-Indian Agent White was writing frequent reports to his superiors at Washington. The ignorance and indifference of government and the public are fictions of a later day."

Here, the writer claims, are three misleading statements, omitting now any reference to what Dr. Whitman did, which will be considered later. (1) As to Fremont, while he may have been under com-

*Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 260.

mission in March, 1843, he did not leave the frontiers of Missouri until the 29th of May, 1843, did not reach the Rockies, the eastern edge of Oregon, until August 20th, did not return to St. Louis until August 6, 1844, and did not make his report in full to his superior officer until March 1, 1845.*

(2) As to Dr. White. Perhaps he was writing frequent reports in March, 1843, but his book only speaks of four or five between 1842 and 1845, not one of which he says had left Oregon by April 1, 1843* Much ignorance these had dispelled and much enthusiasm aroused by March, 1843!

(3) As to the ignorance and indifference of government and the public. That a part of both were neither ignorant or indifferent is granted, but that a very important part of both were ignorant and indifferent must also be granted. In the United States Senate in 1844 a resolution was offered to give the necessary twelve months' notice to Great Britain for the termination of the treaty which granted to both nations "Joint Occupancy" to the then Oregon. It was lost by a vote of 28 to 18, various reasons being given,—fear of war, a bad effect on negotiations soon to be made, the worthlessness of the country and opposition to expansion. In regard to these latter points Mr. Dayton of New Jersey read from the Christian Advocate of February 7, 1844, as follows:

"With the exception of lands along the Willamette and

*Fremont's Exploring Expedition, edition of 1850, pp. 123, 125, 167, 426.

*White's Thrilling Adventures, pp. 171, 172.

strips along a few of the water courses the whole country is among the most irreclaimable barren wastes of which we have read, except the desert of Sahara. Nor is this the worst of it. The climate is so unfriendly to human life that the native population has dwindled away under the ravages of its malaria to a degree which defies all history to furnish a parallel in so wide a range of country."

Again he read from an article in the Louisville Courier,

"Of all the countries on the face of this earth it (Oregon) is the least favored by heaven. It is the mere riddlings of creation. It is almost as barren as the desert of Africa, and quite as unhealthy as the campania of Italy. . . . . Russia has her Siberia, and England her Botany Bay, and if the United States should ever need a country to which to banish its rogues and scoundrels, the utility of such a region as Oregon would be demonstrated. Until then we are perfectly willing to leave this magnificent country to the Indians, trappers and buffaloes that roam over its sand banks, and by the side of its rushing and unnavigable waters."

Mr. Dayton says that this description was somewhat below his estimate, yet he had no doubt that the accounts were substantially correct as applied to the country as a whole, though he had no doubt that there were some green spots in it. He then says,

"Judging from all sources of authentic information to which I have had access, I should think the territory taken together a very poor region for agricultural purposes, and in that respect unworthy of consideration of contest at the hands of this government. How will the speedy settlement of Oregon affect us? In my judgment it must be injuriously. The admission of Oregon as a state to the Union sems to me as undesirable on the one hand as it is improbable on the other; undesirable because

that by the aid of representative principles we have already spread ourselves to a vast and almost unwieldly extent. . . . God forbid that the time should ever come when a state on the banks of the Pacific with its interests and tendencies of trade all looking toward the Asiatic nations of the east shall add its jarring claims to our already distracted and overburdened country."

He then discusses the way of getting to it. By water is too far, 18,000 miles. His sport of the overland trip is comical now. He says,

"The power of steam has been suggested. Talk of steam communication—a railroad to the mouth of the Columbia—why look at the cost and bankrupt condition of railroads proceeding almost from your capital, traversing your great thoroughfares. A railroad across 2500 miles of prairie of desert and of mountain! The smoke of an engine across the terrible fissures of that rocky ledge where the smoke of a volcano only has rolled before! Who is to make this vast internal or rather external improvement—the state of Oregon, or the United States? Whence is to come the power? Who supply the means? The mines of Mexico and Peru, disembowelled, would scarcely pay a penny in the pound of the cost. Nothing short of the lamp of Aladdin will suffice for such an expenditure. The extravagance of the suggestion seems to me to outrun everything which we know of modern visionary scheming. The South Sea bubble, the Dutchman's speculations in tulip roots, our own in town lots and multicaulis are all commonplace ploddings in comparison."

Other senators said that if we obtained Oregon we could not hold it, as it would set itself up as an independent nation after a time.

Mr. Archer said of what he thought to be the only valuable part of Oregon, the Willamette valley,

"this was destitute of harborage and could never command any

by art. The country taken in its whole extent could at no day certainly have a very large production nor any considerable trade."*

Senator Winthrop of Massachusetts in 1844 quoted and commended these sentences from Benton's speech in 1825, (although in 1844 Benton had entirely changed his views):

"The ridge of the Rocky mountains may be named as a convenient natural and everlasting barrier. Along this ridge the western limits of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled God Terminus should be erected on its highest peak, never to be thrown down.*

Senator McDuffie, in January, 1843, a little before Dr. Whitman reached Washington, after ridiculing steam power, said:

"I would not for that purpose (of agriculture) give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I wish the Rocky mountains were an impassable barrier. If there was an embankment of five feet to be removed I would not consent to expend five dollars to remove it, and enable our population to go there. I thank God for his mercy in placing the Rocky mountains there."*

---

*Congressional Globe, Vol. 13, p. 275, etc.

*How Marcus Whitman saved Oregon, p. 41.

*How Marcus Whitman saved Oregon, p. 42. It is a little refreshing to know that some of these statements were answered by quotations from missionaries, as Messrs. Parker and Spalding, and that Mr. Wentworth of Illinois said January 24, 1844: 'Religious enterprise and missionary zeal has done the most that has been done thus far for the settlement of Oregon.' Cong. Record, Vol. 13, p. 92.

And Mr. Webster, who was Secretary of State when Dr. Whitman was at Washington, said in 1846 when much more information had been scattered, that the St. John river on the northeastern boundary of Maine was,

"for all purposes of human use worth a hundred times as much as the Columbia was or ever would be."*

Dr. Silas Reed says that when the subject of Oregon was called to the attention of the Senate it was treated with "a smile of indifference and impatience."*

In addition to these statements of individuals the government was very slow about doing anything. Benton said that so far as the government was concerned it operated to endanger our title to the Columbia, to prevent emigrants and to incur the loss of the country. * * * * "The title to the country being thus endangered by the acts of the government, the saving of it devolved upon the people and they saved." In saying this he refers first to the emigration of 1843.

"To check these bold adventurers was the object of government; to encourage them was the object of some western members of congress on whom (in conjunction with the people) the task of saving the Columbia evidently devolved."*

---

*Webster's speeches, Vol. 1, p. 102.

*Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 697.

*Benton's Thirty Years, Vol. 2, p. 469. By mistake he calls the emigration of 1843 "1842," and 1844 "1843." The one of 1843 was the one Dr. Whitman led safely through.

Says Albert Gallatin in 1846,

"It is a remarkable fact that although the convention has now been in force twenty-seven years, congress has actually done nothing for either of these objects (the promotion of emigration, or the protection of our citizens in Oregon). Enterprising individuals have without any aid or encouragement by government opened a wagon road, eighteen hundred miles in length, through an arid or mountainous region and made settlements on or near the shores of the Pacific without any guaranty for the possession of the land improved by their labors."*

The further indifference of government may be seen from the fact that it was more than two years after the treaty of 1846 was made before congress organized the territory of Oregon, notwithstanding the great desires of the people of Oregon to have it done. Because of Dr. Whitman's earnest appeal to the informal provisional Governor of Oregon, as he felt that there was great danger from the Indians unless the government should extend its protection over the people, Governor Abernethy sent J. Q. Thornton in 1847 to Washington to urge speedy action in the matter. He went by water. Because of the Whitman massacre soon after Judge Thornton left, the legislature of Oregon sent J. L. Meek in the winter of 1847-8 to Washington to still further show the need. The two worked together, and on the last day of the session, August 13, 1848, the territory of Oregon was organized by congress. But even further, congress showed its great zeal for the Oregon settlers (or more truly indifference) by not passing

*Oregon Question by Albert Gallatin, p. 36.

any law by means of which these thousands of Oregon settlers could have any title to their land for two years longer, until September, 1850.

And yet now Professor Bourne says that the ignorance and indifference of the government and the people are fictions of a later day. Surely allowance can be made for Mr. Spalding, after going through the intense strain he did, if any can be made for Professor Bourne!

The question is not how many pages had been printed by government in regard to Oregon, but what effect this information had had on those in authority. Millions of pages are issued now from the government printing presses, which the Senators never read, of whose contents they or the public know practically nothing, and which have no effect on government.

IV. In regard to the main question of Dr. Whitman's alleged services to the nation, six objections are brought against it: That Dr. Whitman's chief object in going east was not to save Oregon to the United States, but to save his mission; that when he was in Washington he accomplished nothing for Oregon; that it was impossible at that time for him or for any one to have done so because there was no danger of losing Oregon; that the whole story was an immense afterthought gotten up for some special purpose; and that he did nothing worth mentioning

to increase the immigration of 1843, or to get it through to the Columbia.

As Prof. Bourne acknowledges that Dr. Whitman went to Washington, no space will be given to this point, although much has been written in previous years to prove that he did not go there.

A. The first objection is that Dr. Whitman's chief object was not to save Oregon when he went east. In answer, the evidence of several witnesses who saw the Doctor at that time will be introduced.

(a) *First witness*—Rev. C. Eells, a co-worker with Dr. Whitman, who arrived in Oregon in 1838. In 1883 he said:

"September, 1842, a letter, written by Dr. Whitman, addressed to Rev. Messrs. E. Walker and C. Eells at Tshimakain, reached its destination and was received by the persons to whom it was written. By the contents of said letter a meeting of the Oregon Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was invited to be held at Waiilatpu. The object of said meeting, as stated in the letter named, was to approve of a purpose formed by Dr. Whitman, that he go east on behalf of Oregon as related to the United States. In the judgment of Mr. Walker and myself that object was foreign to our assigned work. With troubled thoughts we anticipated the proposed meeting. . . . . On Monday, a. m., we arrived at Waiilatpu, and met the two resident families of Messrs. Whitman and Gray. Rev. H. H. Spalding was there. All the male members of the mission were thus together. In the discussion the opinion of Mr. Walker and myself remained unchanged. The purpose of Dr. Whitman was fixed. In his estimation the saving of Oregon to the United States was of paramount importance, and he would make the attempt to do so, even if he had to withdraw from the mission in order to

accomplish his purpose. In reply to considerations intended to hold Dr. Whitman to his assigned work, he said: 'I am not expatriated by becoming a missionary.' The idea of his withdrawal could not be entertained, therefore to retain him in the mission a vote to approve of his making the perilous endeavor prevailed."*

Three points in regard to Dr. Eells's evidence have been advanced to show it to be untrustworthy. (1) That it does not agree with Rev. E. Walker's letter to the Board in 1842, endorsed by Mr. Eells, which pleads strongly that the southern stations in the mission be continued (Bourne 71-2. Marshall 228). This is another instance where, according to these writers the want of evidence in one place proves that the event did not take place. That letter simply discussed the subject which the board controlled and did not discuss with them what was not their business. Neither did it discuss anything about the trip to Washington, or its relation to the protection of the emigrants, although Dr. Whitman had that in mind and planned to go to Washington before he left Oregon.

(2) That this letter does not agree with Mr. Walker's journal, which states that the subject of going east was not discussed until Wednesday morning, the third day of the meeting. But Dr. Eells does not say how much of the meeting was spent in discussing Dr. Whitman's trip east but simply says that a part of two days was spent in consultation. If the journal proves anything, it proves

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 9.

too much for Prof. Bourne's side, as it says no more about Dr. Whitman going east on missionary business than it does on political business and says nothing about his going to Washington. If it proves that he did not go for national objects, it proves also that he did not go on missionary business or to Washington. It is simply another instance of want of evidence. If now Dr. Eells or Mr. Walker were to rise from their graves and say that the letter was written and received as stated by Dr. Eells; that on receiving it they disliked it, yet went to Dr. Whitman's as requested; that the Doctor said nothing on the subject during the first two days, as Mr. Walker stated, and they said nothing, hoping perhaps that the Doctor had given up the idea; that other business was attended to, and that then on the 28th he submitted to them his ideas of going east,—there would be no contradiction between the two. (The writer has acted that way several times and once escaped serious loss, having been asked previously to go on a bond, by seeming cold on the matter when he disliked to say yes, and disliked almost as much to say no, so that although the person had gone out of his way to ask for the final answer, yet on account of this coldness of the writer he was not asked. The result showed that if he had signed the bond he would have been obliged to pay considerable, the person asking having been appointed postmaster and afterwards proving to be a defaulter.)

(3) Prof. Marshall says that Dr. Eells stated that Dr. Whitman's "single object" in going east was to save the country. He did, and it was a mistake which he afterwards corrected. When first asked about the object of the doctor in going east, the national object had so filled Dr. Eells's mind because of its importance that it crowded out the remembrance of the other objects. Dr. Treat objected to the words "single object," but before Dr. Eells learned of this objection, on thinking of the matter he had changed it to the "all controlling object." This the writer has in two papers of his father's, with a copy of a third.

The reader will notice the word "expatriated" in Dr. Eells's statement. Prof. Bourne (91) quotes a letter from Dr. Whitman to the board in which he uses the same word—an uncommon one. Dr. Eells wrote his statement in April, 1883, while it was not known on the Pacific coast until September, 1885, that the above mentioned letter of Dr. Whitman's was in existence. Hence Dr. Eells did not copy the word from that letter.

Prof. Marshall also says in regard to Rev. C. Eells,

> "that as late as April, 1865, he denied to Hon. Elwood Evans the historian of Oregon, any knowledge of anything but missionary business ,as impelling Whitman to make that ride." (235-6).

The writer has questioned Professor Marshall in regard to his authority for this statement

and in his reply the Professor says that Elwood Evans wrote the same to him some seventeen years ago, and that he at or about that time printed the same statement in one of his newspaper articles.*

In reply the writer declares that he will not believe this statement until some better proof is given than this: for (1) the writer has every newspaper article that he ever heard of that Mr. Evans wrote on the subject, especially between 1881 and 1885, and there is not a hint of such a statement in any of these articles. Dr. Eells was then alive and the writer does not think Mr. Evans would have dared then to have made the statement.

(2) The writer will not accept Mr. Evans's statement on the subject even if he did make it to Prof. Marshall, for as has already been shown, Mr. Evans made Mr. Eells say something in regard to the destruction of the records of the meeting of September, 1842, which he did not say, and also made Mr. Webster say something he did not say. (See above p. 23). The writer calls for the letter, and feels sure that if his father had ever written such a letter he would have heard of it before the year 1902, and also that in newspaper articles which he has by Mr. Evans, when he fully discussed Dr. Eells's evidence, Mr. Evans would have printed this letter.

(b) *Second witness*—Dr. William Geiger, who came to Oregon in 1839, had charge of Dr. Whitman's station all the time he was east, except the first two

*Letter to writer dated, Feb. 5, 1902.

or three weeks, remained there three weeks after Dr. Whitman's return, was there again in 1845 and 1846, and had many conversations with him on the object of his journey east. He said (1883):

"His main object in going east was to save the country to the United States, as he believed there was great danger of its falling into the hands of England. Incidentally he intended to obtain more missionary help."*

(c) *Third witness*—Mrs. Mary R. Walker, wife of Rev. E. Walker, another member of the Oregon mission.* She said (1882):

"He [Dr. Whitman] went east in 1842, mainly to save the country from falling into the hands of England, as he believed there was great danger of it. He had written Mr. Walker several times before about it. One expression I will remember he wrote about as follows: 'This country will soon be settled by the whites. It belongs to the Americans. It is a great and rich country. What a country this would be for Yankees? Why not tell them of it.' He was determined to go east on this business, even if he had to leave the mission to do so."*

(d) *Fourth witness*—Hon. A. Hinman, who came to Oregon in 1844, taught school at Dr. Whitman's the next winter, went to the Willamette valley with Dr. Whitman the next June, in 1847 at the Doctor's request was temporarily in charge of the newly acquired station at The Dalles, is now living at Forest Grove, Oregon, has been a member of the

*Mr. Walker died in 1877 before his controversy arose, hence his testimony was not obtained.

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, pp. 3, 11.

Oregon legislature and for twenty years president of the board of trustees of Pacific University. He says (1882):

"Dr. Whitman told me that he went east in 1842 with two objects, one to assist the mission, the other to save the country to the United States. I do not think that he would have gone that winter had it not been that the danger seemed to him very great that the country would be obtained by England, but would have deferred the journey until Spring."*

(e) *Fifth witness*—Hon. A. L. Lovejoy, who came to Oregon in 1842, was Dr. Whitman's traveling companion on his journey east, was afterwards a member of the Oregon legislature several times, president of its council (senate), attorney general of the territory, its chief justice, was mayor of Oregon City, and a member of the convention that formed the state constitution, few of the pioneers doing more than he did. He said (1876), after giving an account of the journey of himself and the Doctor to Bent's Fort:

"Here we parted. The Doctor proceeded to Washington, I remained at Bent's fort until spring and joined the Doctor the following July near Fort Laramie on his way to Oregon in company with a train of emigrants. He often expressed himself to me about the remainder of his journey, and the manner in which he was received at Washington and by the Board of Foreign Missions at Boston. He had several interviews with President Tyler, Secretary Webster, and a good many members of congress, congress being in session at that time. He urged the immediate termination of the treaty with Great Britain relative to this country, and begged them to extend the laws

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 14.

of the United States over Oregon, and asked for liberal inducements to emigrants to come to this coast. He was very cordially and kindly received by the president and members of congress, and without doubt the doctor's interviews resulted greatly to the benefit of Oregon and to this coast."*

Mrs. Lovejoy, who came in 1843,

"assures us that he was aware of Whitman's aims and motives, knew that his great object in the journey was to save Oregon from British rule, and gives him credit in great part for accomplishing his patriotic intention."*

"The whole burden of Dr. Whitman's speech during the long ride, according to Mr. Lovejoy, was to immediately terminate the treaties of 1818 and 1828, and extend the laws of the United States over Oregon."*

These statements will answer Prof. Bourne's quotations from Mrs. Lovejoy and D. P. Thompson made in 1900. (106-109) These were made much earlier and so according to Prof. Bourne's ideas are of much more value.

(f) *Sixth witness*—Hon. W.H. Gray, who was

---

*Biography of Rev. G. H. Atkinson, D. D., p. 275. In the above question the writer is inclined to think that Gen. Lovejoy is mistaken when he says "congress being in session at the time," and that sentence is not in his statement of 1869. It has been very difficult to determine the exact date when Dr. Whitman was at Washington, but from a paper which he left at Boston it appears that he was at Westport, Mo., Feb. 15, and Boston, March 30. Probably he did not reach Washington in sixteen days, and then take twenty-six more to get to Boston. Besides J. M. Porter, with whom the doctor conferred, was not appointed secretary of war until March 8, which was after the adjournment of congress.

*Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Nov. 17, 1882, copied from The Willamette Farmer.

*Paper by Miss S. Barlow in Oregon Pioneer Transactions 1895, p. 74.

a member of the Oregon mission from 1836 to 1842. He says that as the Doctor mounted his horse to start east he said, "If the Board dismisses me I will do what I can to save my country."* And again, "My life is of but little worth if I can save the country for the American people."

Prof. Bourne has learned that there was much trouble between Mr. Gray and Dr. Whitman, and also between Mr. Spalding and Dr. Whitman, while they were in the mission together, so that Mr. Gray left it in September, 1842. Now the question may be very naturally asked, "Why then did these two gentlemen lie to exalt their enemy, Dr. Whitman, and why, if the story is all a legend, invented by Mr. Spalding, did Mr. Gray lie to support the statements of Mr. Spalding, with whom he had so much difficulty?"

(g) *Seventh witness*—Perrin B. Whitman, who was a nephew of Dr. Whitman, came with him to Oregon in 1843 and lived with him until 1847, was at The Dalles with Mr. Hinman at the time of the massacre. He said (1880):

"Dr. Whitman's trip east, in the winter of 1842-43, was for the double purpose of bringing an immigration across the plains, and also to prevent, if possible, the trading off of this northwest coast to the British government. * * * While crossing the plains I repeatedly heard the doctor express himself as being very anxious to succeed in opening a wagon road across the continent to the Columbia river, and thereby stay, if not entirely prevent, the trading of this northwest coast, then pend-

*Gray's History of Oregon, p. 609.

ing between the United States and the British government. In after years the doctor, with much pride and satisfaction, reverted to his success in bringing the immigration across the plains, and thought it one of the means of saving Oregon to his government."

Again (1882) he added:

"I heard him say repeatedly, on the journey and after we reached his mission, Waiilatpu, that he went to the states in the winter of 1842 and 1843 for the sole purpose of bringing an immigration with wagons across the plains of Oregon."*

Again in the Oregonian of December 4, 1895, is a long statement by Mr. Whitman in which he tells how in 1843 he heard his uncle tell this whole story to the Doctor's mother and Perrin's father in New York state, to Dr. Waldo in Missouri. and Rev. Mr. Berryman, superintendent of a Methodist mission there.

(h) *Eighth witness*—Rev. W. Barrows, D. D., who was at St. Louis teaching school when Dr. Whitman arrived on his eastern journey, and boarded

*Weekly Astorian, Dec. 17, 1880 and Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, pp. 12, 13. Prof. Bourne tries to reject the testimony of Mr. Whitman because he was so young, thirteen years, when he came to Oregon. Does the Professor not expect boys of thirteen to remember what they have seen and heard? But he must remember that Perrin Whitman lived with his uncle until he was seventeen and surely many of the Professor's students are only that age. Professor Bourne tries to reject the testimony of Perrin Whitman because he was too young, and of Dr. Silas Reed because he was too old; and of Dr. Whitman, who in 1847 was neither too old nor too young, because by that time he had changed his mind as to his purpose in going east! i. e., that Dr. Whitman did not know five years after he went east why he went so well as the Professor did fifty-seven years after.

under the same roof with him at Dr. E. Hale's. He says:

"The doctor was in great haste, and could not delay to talk of beaver and Indian goods, and wars, and reservations, and treaties. He had questions and not answers. Was the Ashburton treaty concluded? Did it cover the northwest? Where and what and whose did it leave Oregon? He was soon answered. Webster and Ashburton had signed that treaty on the 9th of August preceding. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * Then instantly he had other questions for his St. Louis visitors. Was the Oregon question under discussion in congress? What opinions, projects or bills concerning it were being urged in senate and house? Would anything important be settled before the approaching adjournment on the fourth of March? Could he reach Washington before the adjournment? He must leave at once, and he went."*

Prof. Bourne (40) says that Dr. Barrows was living in St. Louis in 1843 and saw Dr. Whitman there. This he must have learned from Dr. Barrows. If the professor accepts this statement of the Doctor, why does he not also accept what Dr. Barrows says about Dr. Whitman's object in going east? Why accept one of his statements and reject the other?

(i) *Ninth witness*—Dr. Edward Hale. He says (1871):

"I had the pleasure of entertaining Dr. Whitman at St. Louis on his last visit eastward to confer with the president and heads of departments in relation to the settlement of the

*Barrows, Oregon, p. 174, and New York Observer, Dec. 21, 1882.

northeastern boundary question with Great Britain by bartering away for a song the whole of the northwest Pacific territory. Also on his return to Oregon, my house was his home while in St. Louis."*

(j) *Tenth witness*—Dr. S. J. Parker of Ithaca, N. Y., a son of the Rev. S. Parker who went to Oregon in 1835, and who (the son) was then (in 1843) twenty-four years old. He wrote:

"I was at home in the room in which I now write (as I own the old homestead) when Dr. Whitman unexpectedly arrived in a rather rough, but not as outlandish a dress as some writers say he had on. After the surprise of his arrival was over, he said to my father, 'We must both go at once to Washington, or Oregon is lost, ceded to the English.' "*

(k) *Eleventh witness*—John Tyler, jr., son of President John Tyler, and his private secretary. He remembered Dr. Whitman very well, remembered that he was in Washington in 1842-3, full of his project to carry emigrants to Oregon, that he waited on the president, and received from him the heartiest concurrence in his plan.*

(l) *Twelfth witness*—Dr. Silas Reed. He says:

"The following winter, 1842-3, Dr. Whitman, the Oregon missionary, returned to the east, and furnished valuable data about Oregon and the practicability of a wagon route thereto across the mountains, and emigration thither rapidly increased,

*Letter to H. H. Spalding, now in possession of the writer.

*Letter to the writer Feb. 16, 1883. Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 15.

*Mowry's Marcus Whitman, p. 172.

thus aiding in securing a more speedy passage of Dr. Linn's Oregon bill."*

Prof. Bourne thinks that probably this refers to Dr. White, because Linn's bill had passed the senate before Dr. Whitman's arrival. It may be, but it is just as probable that Dr. Reed's memory was at fault in regard to the time of the passage of the bill as that he confounded Dr. White with Dr. Whitman, for Dr. White was not there in 1842-3, and there is no evidence that he furnished any valuable information about a wagon route across the mountains.

(m) *Thirteenth witness*—Rev. Gustavus Hines, a member of the early Methodist mission of Oregon, who came to Oregon in 1840 and left in 1845. He says in his journal of April 14, 1843:

"The arrival of a large party of emigrants about this time [1842] and the sudden departure of Dr. Whitman to the United States, with the avowed intention of bringing back with him as many as he could enlist for Oregon, served to hasten them [the Indians] to the above conclusion," that is, that there was "a deep laid scheme of the whites to destroy them and take possession of their country."*

(n) *Fourteenth witness*—Dr. Whitman. April 1, 1847 he wrote to the American board as follows:

"It was to open a practical route and safe passage and secure a favorable report of the journey from the emigrants, which in connection with other objects caused me to leave my

*Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 697.
*Hines, Oregon, p. 143.

family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey, notwithstanding the unusual severity of the winter and the great depth of snow."*

Prof. Bourne tries to get rid of this evidence by saying "as the years passed, Dr. Whitman attached so much importance to his services to the emigration that he evidently came to regard such a service as the purpose of his journey to the east." (97). Yet Prof. Bourne still clings to the idea that it was an incidental and minor purpose. It is singular with what persistence the opponents of the idea that Dr. Whitman did anything to save Oregon cling to their position. First there was no evidence worth considering, and when ten witnesses who were acquainted with the doctor say that he told them that he went with national intent, then they cannot accept this evidence because it is from memory, and wish for scientific testimony—written at the time; and when Dr. Whitman's own statements are produced, which are scientific, they say that he claimed for himself a purpose five years afterward, that he did not have in 1842, that he told a falsehood because he saw what an advantage it would be to him to make the claim! Prof. Bourne claims to have learned it better fifty-eight years later than Dr. Whitman did five years later.

There are five points in addition from circumstantial evidence.

---

*Missionary Herald, 1885, p. 350.

(o) Dr. Whitman went to Washington before he went to Boston. If his object in going east was solely to save his mission, why did he go to Washington? After the troubles which the American Board had with the government when the Cherokees were removed to the Indian territory and one of their missionaries was imprisoned, the Board had just as little to do with the government as possible. The government would not help Dr. Whitman to induce the American Board to rescind any order of theirs.

(p) If his main object in going east was to secure the rescinding of an order of the Board, why did he go to Washington first? He would certainly have gone to Boston first. When Rev. Jason Lee went east in 1838 carrying a petition to government from the citizens of Oregon, he hastened first to report to his home board at New York. Not so Dr. Whitman. One went mainly for missionary purposes, the other mainly for national purposes.

(q) He left his station October third, when the fifth was the day he told Messrs Walker and Eells that he would go. Letters were to be prepared and forwarded accordingly. They reached his station October fifth, but he was gone. One of these letters is now in the possession of the writer. It is a long, strong plea for the continuance of the southern stations of the mission. Why did he leave that letter, (written by the moderator of the meeting and endorsed by its clerk), which would have been of great

help to him, if his main object had been to secure the rescinding of the above mentioned order?

(r) Although the order had been given to discontinue those stations, yet in view of changed conditions the mission had voted to continue them until word could be sent to Boston and a reply received, and did so. Was it necessary for him to risk his life to secure what he had already temporarily secured, when his station would have been certainly continued had he waited until spring to go?

(s) At first he was not cordially received at Boston. Says Dr. Geiger:

"Mr. Hill, treasurer of the Board, said to him in not a very pleasant way, 'what are you here for, leaving your post?'"

Says P. B. Whitman:

"The Board censured him in very strong terms for leaving his post of duty; also informed him that they had no money to spend in opening the western country to settlement."

Says Dr. Whitman in a letter to the Board dated April 1, 1847:

"I often reflect on the fact that you told me you were sorry I came." (East).

After this he speaks of the great value of his services to the emigration, and of the influence that emigration virtually had in securing Oregon to the

United States. Now why was the Board so sorry he went, if he went solely or mainly to help his mission?

With all this evidence the author would consider himself unreasonable not to believe that Dr. Whitman went east in order to do what he could to save Oregon.

B. The second objection is that Dr. Whitman accomplished nothing at Washington.

(a) Says Dr. W. Geiger:

"Either himself or brother had been a classmate of the secretary of war, and Dr. Whitman went to him and through him obtained an introduction to Secretary Webster. But Webster said that it was too late, that he had signed the papers and given them to the president. He would not introduce him to the president. Dr. Whitman went back to the secretary of war, and through him obtained an introduction to the president, who heard his statements of the value of Oregon, and the possibility of taking an emigration there. At last the president promised to wait before proceeding further in the business, until Dr. Whitman should see whether he could get the emigration through. 'That is all I want,' said Dr. Whitman. He immediately sent back word to Missouri to those who wished to go, and had it published in the papers and in a pamphlet.

"If Dr. Whitman told me this once, he told it to me perhaps twenty times. He told it to me first on his return at Mr. Spalding's station, as I was there temporarily on account of sickness in Mr. Spalding's family. About the same time he told Mr. Spalding the same. He afterwards told it to us both, and in riding together afterwards on the road he said the same, and these repeated statements, which were always precisely alike, impressed it on my mind, or I might perhaps have forgotten them. As far as I know, he told this only to Mr. Spalding and myself, and said he had his reasons for not telling everybody."*

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 3.

Again Dr. Geiger says:

"Dr. Whitman praised the country as of immense value to the United States and said that he had heard that there was a possibility of its being transferred to Great Britain. But Webster replied, 'you are too late, doctor, Oregon is already bargained away.'"

. . . . . He spoke of the distance, the worthlessness of the country, and of the impossibility of making roads to Oregon. Finally he said that the question had been considered and turned over to President Tyler, who could sign Oregon away or refuse to do so, but so far as he had an interest in it, it was already decided and had passed entirely from his hands.

"Through the secretary of war, Dr. Whitman was then introduced to the president and for three or four hours they talked about the country. Finally the president said that if they could get a wagon road across from the western frontier that fact would settle the question, but if it could neither be practically settled by land or by sea, as claimed, it would be better to let the country go than to try to retain, settle and defend it. Dr. Whitman responded, 'Hold on and I will take an emigration and their wagons through next summer.' They talked it all over, and the Doctor explained his plans at length. The president said he had signed no papers and would hold now to see the issue of the Doctor's undertaking. 'If you succeed,' he said, 'we will keep Oregon.' And this was the stimulus which made the Doctor so persevering on that point all the next summer. Dr. Whitman replied most emphatically, bringing his hand down most vigorously on his thigh. 'I'll take them through.' And as Dr. Whitman and Dr. Geiger rode along from Lapwai to Walla Walla, he exultingly added, striking another significant blow with his hand, 'And I have brought them through.'*

(b) Says Rev. H. H. Spalding:

"The doctor pushed on to Washington, and immediately

*Article by S. A. Clarke in the Oregonian, June 1, 1895, from information obtained ten years before.

sought an interview with Secretary Webster—both being from the same state—and stated to him the object of his crossing the mountains, and laid before him the great importance of Oregon to the United States. But Mr. Webster lay too near Cape Cod to see things in the same light with his fellow statesman, who had transferred his worldly interests to the Pacific coast. He awarded sincerity to the missionary, but could not admit for a moment that the short residence of six years could give the doctor the knowledge of the country possessed by Governor Simpson, who had almost grown up in the country, and had traveled every part of it, and represents it as one unbroken waste of sand deserts and impassable mountains, fit only for the beaver, the gray bear and the savage. * * * *

"The doctor next sought through Senator Linn an interview with President Tyler, who at once appreciated his solicitude, and his timely representations of Oregon, and especially his disinterested though hazardous undertaking to cross the Rocky mountains in winter to take back a caravan of wagons. He said that although the doctor's representations of the character of the country, and the possibility of reaching it by wagon route, were in direct contradiction to those of Governor Simpson, his frozen limbs were a sufficient proof of his sincerity, and his missionary character were a sufficient guaranty for his honesty, and he would therefore as president rest upon these and act accordingly; would detail Fremont with a military force to escort the doctor's caravan through the mountains; and no more action should be had toward trading off Oregon till he could hear the results of the expedition. If the doctor could establish a wagon route through the mountains to the Columbia river, pronounced impassable by Governor Simpson and Ashburton, he would use his influence to hold on to Oregon. The great desire of the doctor's American soul, Christian withal, that is, the pledge of the president that the swapping of Oregon with England for a cod fishery should stop for the present, was attained, although at the risk of life, and through great sufferings, and unsolicited and without the promise or expectation of a dollar's reward from any source. And now, God giving him life and strength, he would do the rest, that is, connect the Missouri and Columbia rivers with a wagon track so

deep and plain that neither national envy nor sectional fanaticism would ever blot it out."*

(c) Says Hon. W. H. Gray:

"I met him in Oregon City in my own home, after his return from Washington. Spent an afternoon and evening with him, and learned of him the result of his visit to Washington, and the treatment he received from Webster and from the Prudential Board or Committee of Missions.*

"What I learned from Dr. Whitman personally was: Mr. Webster was favorable to making a change of the eastern boundary, and giving the western or Oregon country for what had recently been in dispute, as Mr. Webster thought it would be a good exchange; and was not induced to listen to his (Dr. Whitman's) reasons against such a change. But the president listened more favorably, and said no such change or giving up of Oregon should be made, if he could get wagons and an emigration into Oregon. * * * Mr. Webster was strongly in favor of the Newfoundland codfishery. He was held in check by Benton, Adams and others. Benton had a better knowledge of Oregon than Webster, who had been or become unpopular for his yielding on the Eastern or Maine question with Ashburton. The petition that had been sent by the missionaries, and the statements made by different parties, added to the personal representations made by Dr. Whitman, as to the practicability of a wagon route, and the fact that the doctor's mission in 1836 had taken cows and wagons to Fort Boise, and that they could be taken to the Columbia river,—that fact, as affirmed by Dr. Whitman, stopped all speculations about giving up Oregon, till the practical road question was settled."*

---

*Executive Document No. 37, 41st congress, third session, p. 22.

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 19.

*Pamphlet by W. H. Gray, Did Dr. Whitman save Oregon, p 17.

(d) Says Perrin B. Whitman:

"Secretary Webster received him coolly. He said he almost 'snubbed him,' but the president, Mr. Tyler, treated him and the possibility of a wagon road across the plains to the Columbia river, with a just consideration. He, the president, gave the doctor a hearing, and promised him that the Ashburton treaty, then pending [a mistake], would not be signed until he would hear of the success or failure of the doctor in opening a wagon road to the Columbia river."*

Again, after speaking of a visit of himself and the Doctor to the Doctor's mother, he added:

"He was of course pressed to extend his visit, but he always replied that he would sacrifice not only the pleasure of a visit with his mother, but all else in the world rather than fail to meet an engagement to be on the west side of the Missouri river at the appointed time to conduct a party of American citizens across the plains. He said 'they have my pledges to guide a wagon train to the Columbia river before the summer is over.' During the visit with his mother and my father I heard him say repeatedly that he had been to Washington City, and had had an interview with President Tyler about the colonization of Oregon with American citizens. He said also that the president promised anxiously to wait for news of the success or failure of the attempt to cross the mountains to the shores of the Columbia with wagons. The success or failure of the effort would in a measure determine the question of title to the Oregon country. I know Dr. Whitman carried home to the Pacific this promise from President Tyler and that the ambition to save Oregon to the United States spurred him on to great self-sacrifice and labor that required almost more than mortal strength." * * * * * *

---

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 13.

Then in speaking of their sojourn at Westport, Missouri, he added:

"The doctor remained for a time at the house of Dr. Waldo, a brother of the Oregon pioneer, Hon. Daniel Waldo. He gave Dr. Waldo an account of his trip across the great plains and emphasized the fact that it was made to save the Pacific northwest to the United States government. His whole soul was in the success of the wagon journey to the banks of the Columbia and he assured Dr. Waldo that the president had promised him to withhold the transfer of the territory to the British until he learned whether he succeeded or not. He talked of this object of his visit with the enthusiasm of a sanguine nature, and he had but one object, to save Oregon. While waiting for the large train of immigrants to organize for the journey Dr. Whitman visited for a week with Rev. Berryman, superintendent of the Methodist Indian mission. During that visit I heard him repeat the substance of that interview with the officials in Washington City, and recite his hopes and fears about the dangers and blessings upon the failure or success of his effort to colonize Oregon with true Americans."*

(e) Says Judge J. Otis, after describing an interview he had at Buffalo, N. Y., with the Doctor in the spring of 1843:

"They [the president and cabinet] were called together and Dr. Whitman spent an evening with the cabinet answering their questions and giving them his views as to the importance of Oregon and the steps that needed to be taken in order to secure it for this country."*

(f) M. de Saint Amant was an envoy of the French government to Oregon in 1851-2 and pub-

*Oregonian, Dec. 4, 1895.
*Missionary Herald, 1885, p. 384.

lished a book "Voyages in California and Oregon" at Paris in 1854. In speaking of Dr. Whitman he says:

> "Having preceded the taking possession of the country by his fellow citizens he became a very active agent of the American interests, and contributed in no small degree to annexation, but in spite of all he did for them [the Indians], he did not realize that his standing and influence would not always prevail against the consequences of the superstition of the savages and he fell a victim to it with his family." (pp. 223-4).

Prof. Bourne says in regard to this that it has reference to Dr. Whitman's entire work down to 1847 and says nothing about the year 1842-3; that he probably derived his information from Bishop Brouillet or some of his missionary colleagues, and that the assertion about the tendency of Whitman's political activity is hardly more than a natural deduction from such statements as Brouillet made in his pamphlet.

But the writer asks, if Dr. Whitman contributed in no small degree to annexation, when he did it, if not during 1842-3. Was it before he went east? or after he had come back, when there was no possible danger of Oregon being lost. If Prof. Bourne believes this, he believes that of which there is not a thousandth part of the proof as compared with the claim that he contributed in 1842-3, but if it is so the writer would be very glad to have him prove it. If Saint Amant learned this from some of the Catholic priests, then it was a matter of public knowledge at that time. There is a hint here too that the report

was that Dr. Whitman lost his life because of his political activity.

(g) Dr. Whitman wrote November 5, 1846, to Rev. L. P. Judson:

"I had adopted Oregon as my country as well as the Indians for my field of labor, so that I must superintend the immigration of that year, [1843] which was to lay the foundation for the speedy settlement of the country if prosperously conducted and safely carried through; but if it failed and became disastrous, the reflex influence would be to discourage for a long time any further attempt to settle the country across the mountains, which would be to see it abandoned altogether. * * * * * * I have returned to my field of labor and in my return brought a large immigration of about a thousand individuals safely through the long, and the last part of it an untried route to the western shores of the continent. * * * * * * * It is quite important that such a country as Oregon should not on one hand fall into the exclusive hands of the Jesuits, nor on the other under the English government."*

Again, April 1, 1847, soon after he heard of the treaty which settled the Oregon question, he wrote to his home Board:

"I often reflect on the fact that you told me you were sorry I came east. It did not then nor has it since altered my opinion in the matter. American interests acquired in the country which the success of the immigration in 1843 alone did and could have secured, have become the foundation of the late treaty between England and the United States in regard to Oregon. * * * * * * It demonstrates what I did in making my way to the states in the winter of 1842-3, after the third of October. * * * * * * * Anyone can see that American interests as now acquired have had more to do in

*Transactions Oregon Pioneer Association 1893, p. 200.

securing the treaty than our original rights. From 1835 till now it has been apparent that there was a choice of only two things, (1) the increase of British interests to the exclusion of all other rights in the country, or (2) the establishment of American interests by citizens" [on the ground.]

Again, October 18, 1847, he wrote to the same Board:

"Two things, and it is true those which were most important were accomplished by my return to the states. By means of the establishment of the wagon road, which is due to that effort alone, the immigration was secured and saved from disaster in the fall of 1843. Upon that event the present acquired rights of the United States by her citizens hung, and not less certain is it that upon the result of that immigration to this country the present existence of Protestantism hung also."*

There is no doubt but that Dr. Whitman, after his experience at Washington and with the emigration of 1843, knew what he was saying fully as well as those who from thirty-five to sixty years afterwards, have denied him any national intent or success. These statements of his fit into those of Messrs. Geiger, Gray, Spalding and P. B. Whitman exactly as a tenon does into a mortise.

C. The third objection is that in 1843 it was impossible for Dr. Whitman or any one to have done anything to save Oregon, because it was in no danger

*Missionary Herald, Sept. 1885.

of being lost. Here the question very seriously arises, shall we accuse all these witnesses of falsehood and reject all their evidence, that of Messrs. Geiger, Gray, P. B. Whitman, Lovejoy and Marcus Whitman, as well as that of Mr. Spalding, or is there some way of reconciling apparent differences? In the writer's opinion it is not necessary to reject their statements, for he believes that so much light has already been found that no one need be accused of falsehood. It can be shown that in the main their statements and the actual condition of affairs at Washington may be reconciled, although it is true that no evidence has been found that any treaty was then in progress and no state papers have been found which speak of Webster trading Oregon for the Newfoundland cod-fishery.

(1) First we will consider Webster's position, because he had already negotiated the Ashburton treaty in which Oregon was considered, because he was in March, 1843, secretary of state, and so a very important factor in whatever might be done in regard to the question, and because he was remaining in the cabinet with the hope of being the one who would negotiate the treaty which would settle the Oregon question. The plan of the administration was this: Either a special mission to England on which it was expected that Mr. Webster would be sent in order that he might be better able to negotiate the treaty, or a mission to China to which Mr. Everett then our minister to England, would be transferred, thus allowing Mr. Webster to go to England in Mr.

Everett's place, where he could still negotiate the treaty. But the special mission to England was voted down in the senate committee, the mission to China passed congress but Mr. Everett declined to go to China and so Mr. Webster failed to go to England. Thus his hopes of reaching England for that purpose died, and as this had been his main reason for remaining in the cabinet, he soon resigned, and then passed forever all danger of England gaining even that part of Oregon north of the Columbia and south of the forty-ninth parallel or any more further south.*

But in March, 1843, Mr. Webster had not given up these hopes, and so it is very necessary to know his position. True, in 1846, in a speech before the senate, he said that when he made the Ashburton treaty in 1842 he had told Lord Ashburton, "The government of the United States has never offered any line south of forty-nine degrees and it never will." As far as the last sentence "it never will," is concerned it was merely his opinion in 1842 and as he was not a prophet it might have been done had circumstances seemed to warrant it. As far as the first sentence is concerned Mr. Benton gives the reason, namely that the two senators from Missouri (Benton and Linn) having been

"sounded on the subject of a conventional divisional line, repulsed the suggestion with an earnestness which put an end to it. If they had yielded the valley of the Columbia would have been divided."*

---

*Quarterly, Oregon Historical Society, Sept. 1900, p. 240; Adams Memoirs, Vol. 11, 327, etc., 345 etc.; Schouler, Vol. 4, 436, etc,, and Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, pp. 262-3.

*Benton's Thirty Years, Vol. 2, p. 476.

Mr. Benton gives as the reason why they were sounded the following: That various senators were sounded on points in which they were greatly interested so that when the vote would be taken in the senate in regard to confirming the treaty a majority would be pledged to vote in favor of it. But this statement shows that in 1842 Mr. Webster was willing to yield the country north of the Columbia without any equivalent being given to England to it.

In fact as regards the navigation of the Columbia and the straits, sounds and islands of Puget Sound, he said publicly that he did not stand firm for this in 1842. His words are, (1846).

"the use of the Columbia river by England, permanently or for a number of years, and the use of the straits and sounds in the adjacent sea, and the islands along the coast, would be all matters for friendly negotiation."*

Think of our being in a war with England and she by treaty having the use of the Columbia river permanently!

Mr. Webster's idea of the value of Oregon may be gathered from his speech in 1846 (when immensely more was known of its value than in 1843) in which he said that the St. John river on the northeast boundary of Maine was for all purposes of human use worth a hundred times as much as the Columbia was or ever would be.*

---

*Works of Daniel Webster, Vol. 5, p. 77.

*Webster's speeches, Vol. 5, p. 102.

Twiss, an English writer, said in 1846 that Webster's anticipations were that Oregon would form at some not very distant day, because of its geographical position, an independent confederation.*

This was not an uncommon idea, for Albert Gallatin argued in favor of its probability and said that Jefferson had had the same idea.*

Mr. Webster also wrote to Edward Everett in regard to Oregon, November 25, 1842,

"I doubt exceedingly whether it is an inviting country for agricultural settlers. At present there are not above seven hundred white persons in the whole territory, both sides of the river from California to latitude fifty-four."*

Again when there was a proposition before the senate for a mail route from Independence, Mo., to the mouth of the Columbia Mr. Webster, after denouncing the measure generally said:

"What do you want of that vast and worthless area? this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands, and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put those great deserts, and those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of three thousand miles, rock bound, cheerless, uninviting and not a harbor on it? What use have we for this country?"*

---

*Twiss' History of Oregon, Ed. 1846, p. 264.

*Gallatin's Oregon Question, p. 48.

*Von Holst's Constitutional Hist., U. S., Vol. 3, p. 51.

*The writer cannot give the book and page where this is to be found. It is a part of a reply of Mrs. C. S. Pringle to Mrs. F. F. Victor's attack on Dr. Whitman, written Dec. 1, 1884, which the writer has in manuscript.

In 1845 in opposing the admission of Texas he said:

"The government is very likely to be endangered in my opinion by a further enlargement of the territorial surface already so vast, over which it is extended,"*

thus placing himself plainly against expansion after Dr. Whitman went east. Here we have then Mr. Webster's position: Oregon not worth much, not a hundredth part as much as the valley of the St. John's, not wanted because the United States already had as much territory as she ought to have and because it might set itself up as independent even if the United States should obtain a nominal title to it, and he was ready to yield all north of the Columbia river in 1842. And he was secretary of state, the one to largely influence our business with foreign countries!

(2) But more than this, there was talk of trading off Oregon. In 1827 a resolution had been introduced into congress by Mr. Knight of Rhode Island, asking the president to open negotiations with Great Britain to exchange Oregon for Upper Canada. In 1844 Mr. Choate, senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Webster's state (Mr. Webster not then being in the senate) hinted again at equivalents for Oregon. This alarmed Mr. Breese of Illinois, who did not know what was meant unless it might be money, or something like Mr. Knight's idea of 1827.

In a speech of Senator D. R. Atchison of Mis-

*Barrows' Oregon, p. 200.

souri as late as February 22, 1844, in congress he said:

"Give us the countenance of our government; give us your protection; give us government and laws, and we will soon fill up the country (Oregon); we will take possession of it, and we will keep that possession. Do but assure us that we will not be traded off, that we are not to become British subjects, that we are to remain members of this glorious republic, we will take possession and we will keep that possession in defiance of British power."*

He would never have said this had he not known that there was danger that Oregon would be traded off.

Still further in 1844 a bill was introduced before the senate asking for all the correspondence and instructions on the subject of Oregon since March 4, 1841. In January, 1844 Mr. Benton while discussing this bill said:

"The senator from Ohio, Mr. Allen, has read you a part of the debate in parliament in February last [1843, just before Dr. Whitman reached Washington,] in which the British minister, Sir Robert Peel, has made a very extraordinary declaration—a declaration in full terms—that President Tyler has made propositions on the subject of Oregon, which would render it impossible for him to have signed the bill which passed the senate at the last session, to grant land to the Oregon settlers. His word is 'impossible.'"

The bill before the senate however was lost by a vote of 31 to 14, the correspondence was not obtained and the writer has been unable to learn certainly

*See Oregonian, Nov. 26, 1897.

what that communication was by the president to Great Britain. But it is plain from this that some very important paper had at that time been sent to England, the contents of which threatened the possession of Oregon by the United States. It may, however have referred to the tri-partite plan, which will soon be explained and which neither England nor the United States could have settled without the consent of Mexico.

Other items too are significant. In December, 1842, the senate requested of President Tyler information about the Oregon question. His reply was that he had in his annual message stated that he should not delay to urge on Great Britain the importance of an early settlement. He added:

> "Measures have been already taken in pursuance of the purpose thus expressed, and under these circumstances I do not deem it consistent with the public interest to make any communication on the subject."*

Yet none of these measures have been found, that is official ones, but simply private letters and papers to some of which reference will here be made. No official ones have been found until October 9, 1843.

There was a tripartite plan under consideration.* England, Mexico and the United States were to be the three parties in it. English capitalists had loaned Mexico some ten million pounds, which was secured on lands in Senora, Chihuahua, California

*Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. 4, p. 211.
*Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 260-1.

and New Mexico. Because of this England had an influence in Mexican affairs. Texas had then recently seceded from Mexico and was trying to establish her independence. Knowing of this influence of Great Britain, President Tyler sought by this "tripartite treaty to secure the independence of Texas as well as the cession of California to the United States, as far south as thirty-six degrees, on England's contributing a certain sum for its purchase, in return for the line of the Columbia as the boundary of Oregon." England had from 1818 insisted on this line, while the United States had insisted on the line of forty-nine degrees. But for some years government had thought of the value of California and had been quietly exploring parts of it. Commodore Wilkes in 1841 had praised the harbor of San Francisco as "one of the finest, if not the very best harbor in the world." When Lord Ashburton was in the United States in the summer of 1842 he had been asked if he thought England would make any objections to the United States obtaining that part of California north of thirty-six degrees and replied that he thought not. The south was willing, for she wanted more slave-holding territory. President Tyler was a strong southern man from Virginia, who in 1861 helped to vote his state out of the Union in the state convention. Webster was from the far east and we already know his ideas of Oregon. England gave her consent to this tripartite agreement. President Tyler wrote about January,

1843 to Daniel Webster in regard to this arrangement:

"The three interests would be united and would satisfy all sections of the country. Texas might not stand alone, nor would the line proposed for Oregon. Texas would reconcile all to the line, while California would reconcile or pacify all to Oregon."

Again he wrote to Mr. Webster a letter marked "private."

"A single suggestion as to our conversation this morning. The assent of Mexico to such a treaty is all that is necessary as to all its parts. A surrender of her title is all that will be wanting. The rest will follow without an effort."*

General Almonte, Mexican minister at Washington, was interviewed on the subject. He at first declined, but at last gave way. The president so far succeeded as to lay the subject before congress, proposing either a special mission to England, with Mr. Webster as the one to fill it, or of a mission to China to which Mr. Everett, then minister to England, was to go while Mr. Webster was to take his place. This has already been referred to and its failure. But March 27, 1843, J. Q. Adams, chairman of the house committee on foreign relations, called on Mr. Webster, who told him that he, Webster, had a private letter from Lord Ashburton.

"They will take the line of the Columbia river, and let us stretch south at the expense of Mexico."*

As everything in regard to this plan could not

*Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 261.
*Adams Memoirs, Vol. 11, p. 345, etc.

be arranged satisfactorily before the adjournment of congress on March 4, the president's idea was to have congress while in session authorize him, if he should think it best, to carry out the above plan in regard to Mr. Webster after it should adjourn. As we here see the consent of Mexico was not obtained until after congress had adjourned, but Webster worked on for the consummation of the plan, for, although the senate had refused to allow the special mission to England, yet it had authorized one to China and it was not until Mr. Everett declined to go there that Mr. Webster gave up his hopes of making the Oregon treaty.

Still further we read:

"Mr. Webster did have a commercial treaty on hand when he left the cabinet, and he did contemplate the cession of the northwestern part of Oregon to the Columbia;" also "there was a decided difference between the president and his secretary of state, as to the extent and nature of the proposed equivalent. Webster might have looked more at the commercial features which were to be the outcome of his negotiations in England, and the president more to the landed consideration. . . . . Certain it is, however, that Mr. Tyler was very encouraging in his language to Whitman, his project agreeing precisely with the views he held, as to the ultimate settlement of the question and it was partly due to the warm support and endorsement of the president that Whitman was enabled to land two hundred wagons in Oregon, and accomplish at once the end contemplated by Linn's bill, and without a breach of treaty."*

Prof. Bourne argues that if Dr. Whitman were in Washington he did not have any influence in the

*Letters and Times of the Tylers, Vol. 2, p. 439.

matter, for he says that Webster revealed it to John Quincy Adams March 25, and about the same time or later approached General Almonte, the Mexican minister on the subject, which Prof. Bourne says shows that Dr. Whitman's interview if there was any, had not had the slightest effect. That they had not the slightest effect with Webster is precisely what the evidence of Dr. Geiger and others shows. Hence Webster went on with his plans. Prof. Bourne also says in connection that Dr. Whitman arrived later than March 3 but probably not so late as the 25th. The writer's opinion from the evidence is that he was there about that time. He was at Westport, Mo., February 15, and at Boston March 30, according to a memorandum of his at Boston; he was at New York March 28, according to a letter of his, now extant, which he wrote from that place to the government in regard to some claims of W. H. Gray against the government; and the Weekly Tribune of March 30, speaks of an interview with him. This would evidently place him in Washington from the 20th to the 28th of March. It was plainly after March 3, as in the letter which accompanied Dr. Whitman's proposed bill which was addressed to James M. Porter, secretary of war, he speaks of having been requested to prepare the bill by the secretary, and Mr. Porter was not appointed to that position until March 8.

The above extracts answer plainly a statement made by those who deny that Dr. Whitman saved Oregon, namely that there was no danger of its being lost because there are no official papers to be found

which speak of it. But here we find that there were personal conversations and private letters of great importance going on in reference to government secrets but which were not official and so never laid before congress or made public. This has always been the case with the foreign affairs of our government. Hon. George H. Williams, of Oregon, at one time attorney general of the United States, was one of the commissioners to negotiate the treaty of Washington in regard to the Alabama claims. When these facts about Dr. Whitman were laid before him he said that the story was strictly reasonable; that no record is made of a treaty until negotiated and approved by the president, and that cabinet officers and foreign ministers negotiate treaties for the president and congress to approve.* This being so, if a treaty had secretly been under consideration to which Webster had given his consent but which the president had not approved, though he was seriously thinking of doing so, and if then the promise of Dr. Whitman to take an emigration with wagons to Oregon stopped the president, no papers in reference to such treaty would probably ever be found.

The above has however been found, because John Quincy Adams wormed it out of Mr. Webster during a three hours' interview, or probably it would not now be known. Mr. Adams gives this account of it under date of March 25, 1843, on which day he called on Mr. Webster; he says:

---

*Oregonian, June 1, 1895.

"I spoke of the senate bill for the occupation of the Oregon territory, of Captain Catesby Jones' exploit at Monterey, of the movements in and about Texas, and I suddenly asked him if Waddy Thompson [U. S. minister to Mexico] had been instructed to negotiate for the acquisition of California. He faltered and said he did not know whether he could answer that question consistently with his official duty. I told him his declining to answer was enough for me, and we had warm and almost—not quite angry words. I kept my temper but pressed him more closely, upon his declining to answer my question, than was comfortable to him. He had begun by professing profound confidence in me, and in communicating his own instruction to Edward Everett and Upshur's to Commodore Matthew C. Perry, had said he would open to me administration secrets. Why he should now stop short and roll himself up in mystery upon the plea of official duty, he did not explain . . . . . I said I would not press him to divulge administration secrets that he was inclined to withhold, that he had volunteered the confidence of the administration secrets, and I could not see why it should be tendered on one point of the system of foreign affairs and denied on another."

After some more talk on the Texas and the Mexican question, Mr. Adams says:

"I replied with warmth till at last he told me that he had talked over the Oregon question with Lord Ashburton, [summer of 1842] that England wanted to come down on the coast of the Pacific to the mouth of the Columbia river, and that the question had been put to him whether if a cession from Mexico south of our present boundary of forty-two to include the port of San Francisco could be obtained, England would make any objection to it, and Lord Ashburton thought she would not."*

The remark will probably be made that this ac-

*Adams Memoirs, Vol. 11, p. 345.

count thoroughly disposes of the oft repeated statement that Webster was about to trade off Oregon or a part of it for the Newfoundland codfishery. It may; it may not. If all the adminstration secrets of that time have been divulged, without doubt it does. It has however taken until 1897, fifty-five years after Dr. Whitman went east, during sixteen of which there was a controversy on this subject, for the public on the Pacific coast to learn from either side these facts about the tripartite plan. This being so there may yet be some administration secrets about Oregon not yet discovered. As yet the writer has been unable to find any particulars about the commercial treaty to which reference has been made, which Webster had under consideration in the spring of 1843.

A letter of January 12, 1902, to the writer from Hon. S. A. Clarke, who is in the land office at Washington says that on request, H. H. Gilfry, who has been for twenty years legislative clerk of the senate has presented this question of the Newfoundland fisheries ever being talked of as an exchange for Oregon to Senator Lodge of Massachusetts, who is well posted on all question of history. The senator's reply was that from the earliest time there has been a mixed controversy as to what was contemplated in the way of treaty with England, especially what was proposed when the Ashburton treaty was pending, and while he has often tried to ascertain more particulars of the questions pending in this connection it has been impossible to arrive at any definite conclusions as to what turn negotiations took. This confirms

what Judge G. H. Williams said that no records of negotiations pending are made until definite conclusions are reached and shows us that we are not certain what was contemplated in the commercial treaty, and also that the fishery question may have been under consideration at some time and yet we know nothing about it.

Still, if when the evidence of all that was done at that time shall be learned it shall be found that the results of Dr. Whitman's efforts saved Oregon from being traded off for California instead of for the Newfoundland codfishery the honor to him will be just as great.

It is not at all strange that there have been rumors on the Pacific coast about the codfishery trade. There was a fishery question which Webster had under consideration at that time. In a letter to his daughter, Mrs. Page, August 23, 1842, he says:

> "The only question of magnitude about which I did not negotiate with Lord Ashburton is the question respecting the fisheries."*

There are said to have been rumors about this in connection with Oregon about that time;* and the question of the fisheries on the northeast coast was not settled until it was done by a treaty which was concluded June 5, 1854, and proclaimed September 11, following. Then again while Dr. Whitman was on his way to Washington, Webster was in private cor-

*Bourne, p. 82. Webster's Private correspondence II, 146, and Barrows, Oregon, p. 234.

*Nixon's How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon, p. 126.

respondence with Lord Ashburton with reference to Oregon.* Dr. Whitman without doubt never heard of the tripartite plan, at it was an administration secret, and may have judged that the plan was to settle both the Oregon and fishery question in this way, and this may have given rise to the report of which Mr. Spalding wrote. This is simply a theory of the writer.

One thing is certain however from the foregoing evidence, that there was great danger that at least a part of Oregon would be traded to Great Britain.

If the claim made by the friends of Dr. Whitman is not true, will any one answer the following question? October 18, 1842, Lord Aberdeen had through H. I. Fox, the British minister at Washington, consulted with Secretary Webster about resuming negotiations on the Oregon question. November 25 following, Mr. Webster replied, saying that the president concurrred in the suggestion and would make a communication to our minister in England at no distant day. Not till October 9, 1843, were any more official communications, yet found, made on the subject. Then Secretary Upshur, who had succeeded Secretary Webster July 24, 1843, wrote, October 3, 1843, to Edward Everett, our minister in London, allowing him to tender the forty-ninth parallel again. Why now for nearly a year was no letter written which the authors cared to make public, when the

*It was Lord Ashburton who wrote that England was willing to take the line of the Columbia and let us stretch south at the expense of Mexico.

president had said that at no distant day one should be, and that too at a time when the subject was by no means sleeping, either at Washington or among the people? The answer very naturally comes: *the president wished to learn practically the success of the emigration of 1843.*

In confirmation of this E. D. P. in 1870 wrote that an eminent legal gentleman of Massachusetts and a personal friend of Mr. Webster with whom he had several times conversed on the subject, remarked to E. D. P.

"It is safe to assert that our country owes it to Dr. Whitman and his associate missionaries that all the territory west of the Rocky mountains and south as far as the Columbia river, is not now owned by England and held by the Hudson's Bay Company."*

E. The fourth objection to the Whitman story is because it was not published earlier than 1864. Mrs. F. F. Victor said that nobody heard of it before 1866; Governor Evans said, before 1865; Professor Bourne says, 1864. As far as the writer knows, the full story was first published in the Sacramento Union in 1864.

---

*This quotation has always been credited to the New York Independent of Jan. 27, 1870, but a search in the files of that paper fails to find it. The writer has the whole article, entitled "A Martyr to Civilization." It was found as a scrap of newspaper among Mr. Spalding's papers and is signed E. D. P., or E. D. B., or E. D. R., for the last letter is slightly torn. The paper was dated January 27, 1870.

There were three reasons why it was not published earlier. It must be remembered that the seed then sown did not fully bring forth fruit until the Oregon treaty was made in 1846; and that in 1847, when Dr. Whitman was killed, the missions were broken up.

(1) One reason for not publishing the story earlier is that it would have been very unwise to have done so before the breaking up of the missions. The mission was entirely dependent on the Hudson's Bay Company for all its supplies. Far inland as it was, it could not have existed had the company cut off these supplies. On account of this the missionaries were forbidden by the American Board to in any way interfere with the business of the company, "not even to touch beaver skins" as Dr. Cushing Eells once said.* To have proclaimed publicly what Dr. Whitman had done might have so alienated the company that they would have cut off the supplies, for what he did do in bringing the emigration through resulted in taking Oregon from the company. The evidence however now is that Dr. Whitman did say something about this object of his journey before he started east, but afterwards became quite cautious and on his way back told it to

*Prof. Bourne likewise says (80) quoting from Greenhow (p. 396) that a worthy missionary on the Columbia declared that "he would not buy a skin to make a cap" without the consent of the Hudson's Bay Company, who, he added, had treated him very kindly. Prof. Bourne thinks this may refer to Dr. Whitman and it is very probable, as he was the only missionary who went east, who could properly be said to be on the Columbia at that time—1845.

none of the emigrants of 1843 who would do much of their trading at Vancouver, the headquarters of the company, and only to a few trusted friends after his return. According to Dr. Geiger the Doctor

"asserted that he was so anxious to prevent trouble and hold in check the hostility that would be natural in those who upheld British interests that he never alluded to his wish to save Oregon from British ascendancy, or conversed with any one on that subject on the journey."*

(2) Mrs. Walker gives another reason. She says:

"Much was said about that time about the Methodist missionaries coming here, and then leaving their legitimate missionary calling to make money and for other purposes, and some disgrace was brought on the missionary cause. Mr. Walker and associates felt that Dr. Whitman in leaving missionary work, and going on this business, was likely also to bring disgrace on the cause, and were so afraid of it that for a long time they would hardly mention that object of Dr. Whitman's journey publicly. I remember plainly that Mr. Walker often prayed after Dr. Whitman had gone, that if it was right for him to go on this business, he might be preserved, but if not his way might be hedged up. When the statements first began to be made publicly of this political object of Dr. Whitman's journey east, we were then afraid that disgrace would be brought on our mission."*

To show that there was reason for this fear two quotations will be given, for while the writer does not say that they are just, yet they show what was said at the time.

---

*Oregonian, June 1, 1895, but the statement was made ten years earlier.

*Eells-Whitman pamphlet, p. 11.

Rev. C. G. Nicolay, an English writer, says of the missionaries, "On the Willamette they sink into political agents and would-be legislators."* Again Rev. S. Olin, a Methodist bishop, says:

"The missionaries were in fact mostly engaged in secular affairs, concerned in claims to large tracts of land, claims to city lots, farming, merchandizing, grazing, housekeeping, lumbering and flouring. We do not believe that the history of missions exhibits another such spectacle," and he adds that "the mission became odious to the growing population."*

These things having been written by Protestant clergymen, it is easy to see what remarks would be made by rough mountaineers and others who cared almost nothing for religion, however unjust they might be. Hence the wisdom of the reason given by Mrs. Walker for keeping silence as to Dr. Whitman's work.

(3) A third reason why the story was not published earlier after the death of Dr. Whitman by Messrs. Eells and Walker is that they were not writers for the press. Outside of their reports to the Board, which it was necessary for them to write, and some sermons and addresses written for delivery but published by request, the writer does not know that both of them ever wrote but one newspaper article, and that was a correction to some mistakes by a third

*Nicolay's Oregon Territory, Ed. 1846, p. 178.
*History of the Catholic church in Oregon, p. 13.

person, and none previous to 1864. To them it was a great task to write for the press.

Mr. Spalding was however a willing writer for the press, but in 1848 the overwhelming thought in his mind was the Whitman massacre and its causes. He believed the Catholics to have been the prime cause.* To prove this was his great desire, and he published his views in the Oregon American and Evangelical Unionist. That paper suspended in 1849 owing to the exodus to the newly discovered gold mines in California, before it had finished publishing his articles. It was not long before Mr. Spalding sought other papers in which to publish his views, but in those days and for several years afterwards they were very few in Oregon and they refused him the use of their columns, knowing how severe he was against the Catholics, and not wishing to antagonize that element. He felt it keenly and often spoke of it to his friends. Hence it was not until 1864 or 1865 that he found a place to publish his views. Then he wrote of Dr. Whitman's trip east. Had Mr. Spalding lived fifteen years longer and heard it said that the story was not true because he did not publish it earlier, he would undoubtedly have thought it hard to be so blamed, when that was the very thing he had been trying to do for years. When he did so first in Oregon in the Albany States Rights Democrat, 1867-9, he connected it with the whole history of the mission in so long a series of articles that at the re-

*Prof. Bourne (28) says that he was "almost if not quite a monomaniac on the subject."

quest of some of the subscribers they were cut short and discontinued.

But although not published earlier the story was heard by many in early days. Soon after this objection was raised, the writer in 1885 sent letters of inquiry to a number of persons asking when and from whom they first heard the story. For want of room only a few of the replies can here be given, but the main points in each were published in the Oregonian of May 21, 1885.

Said Dr. A. H. Steele of Olympia, when told that Governor Evans said that no one before 1865 claimed that Dr. Whitman saved the country: "Mr. Walker told me that in Oregon City ten years before that."

Judge R. P. Boise of Salem came to Oregon in 1851 and said he heard from Rev. C. Eells that year the idea that

"Had not the missionaries been here in those early days and advised the United States government of the value of the country, it would have passed under the British crown, and the flag of the Union never floated over it."*

Says Mr. G. F. Colbert, of Crawfordsville, Oregon:

"As to the facts in the case about Dr. Whitman and his journey east, I know nothing, as it all took place before I came to the country, but when Victor, Evans and Company say that nobody ever heard that the Doctor's object was to save Oregon until 1865 or 1866, they are mistaken. I certainly heard Mr. Spalding tell all about it in the fall of 1852."

*Transactions Oregon Pioneer Association, 1876, p. 26.

Says Luther White of Brownsville, Oregon:

"I became acquainted with Mr. Spalding in the summer of 1849. Sometime in September following I had an interview with him. I asked him what he thought was the probable cause of the massacre. Mr. Spalding related the story of Dr. Whitman's winter journey to the Atlantic states in order to secure Oregon to the United States, as perhaps the prime cause. I heard Josiah Osborne [who was at Dr. Whitman's at the time of the massacre] tell the same thing in substance. I think Mr. Osborne said he received his information from Dr. Whitman. The conversation with Mr. Osborne was after the conversation with Mr. Spalding; I think in 1850."

Says Mr. H. L. Brown, of Brownsville, Oregon, an emigrant of 1846:

"My first acquaintance with Rev. H. H. Spalding was in the winter of 1848-9, when he and P. B. Whitman came to my house and remained several days, and to the best of my recollection he made the statement to me at that time that the object of Dr. Whitman's trip back east in 1842-3 was to use his influence with the authorities at Washington for the purpose of saving Oregon to the American people, and bringing a train of immigrants across the plains in 1843. I then went to California in the spring of 1849 and did not return home until January, 1850, when I found Rev. H. H. Spalding my nearest neighbor, and from that time on for several years I can positively state that I heard Mr. Spalding frequently relate that the main object of Dr. Whitman's trip back east was to use his influence with the authorities as above stated and to bring immigrants across the plains to the Columbia river. And I can further state that I was a member of the territorial legislature of Oregon in 1854-5 when I became acquainted with Hon. A. L. Lovejoy, who was a member of said legislature, when I heard him relate the story of the trip across the plains with Dr. Whitman in 1842-3 and to the best of my recollection his statement in regard to the object of Dr. Whitman's trip back east was substantially the same as that made by H. H. Spalding."

Says the late Horace Hart, of Prescott, Washington, an emigrant of 1846:

"In regard to the story about Dr. Whitman's journey east in 1842-3 to save a part of this northwest coast to the United States, I will state that both Mr. Spalding and his wife told me of it in the fall of 1846 and I feel tolerably certain that I heard Dr. Whitman and Mr. Spalding talking about it in the winter of 1847, while the Doctor was at Mr. Spalding's mission on the Lapwai."

Other witnesses are Prof. Thomas Condon of Eugene, Oregon, who came to Oregon in 1853 and heard it that fall; Mrs. G. F. Colbert who heard it from Mr. Spalding in 1852; Rev. H. Lyman who came in 1849 and heard of it in 1850 or 1851; Rev. O. Dickinson from Mr. Spalding and Dr. Atkinson about 1857; Mr. James Blakley in 1849 from Mr. Spalding, and Dr. G. H. Atkinson some years before 1865. Mrs. Colbert went to Brownsville in the fall of 1852 to teach school, and while boarding round made her home in Mr. Spalding's family. She believes she heard the same statement as Mr. Colbert gives, privately at this time, though she thinks she heard it previously in a sermon, which was the first time she heard it.

Prof. Bourne does not like to accept such evidence because it is from memory about thirty-five years afterwards. It was not obtained earlier because the statement that nobody ever heard the story before July 4, 1865 was not made until December 26, 1884, during the controversy of 1884-5, and then by Mr. Evans. In consequence the writer at once tried

to learn the truth about the matter and wrote to nine individuals, six of them on the same day, five of whom he never has met, and some of whom he had never heard of until a few days before he wrote. Some of these lived in the lower Willamette valley, some in the upper Willamette, fifty to eighty miles apart, and one in Eastern Washington more than three hundred miles from the nearest of the others. Several of these replies were dated the same day, others within a few days, hence they could not be charged with conspiring together to make the same statement. If any person does so believe, he has greater credulity than the writer. Such an amount of similar evidence ought, in the opinion of the writer, to convince any one that the story was heard in Oregon long before Messrs. Bourne and Evans acknowledge.

The statement of Saint Amant (above, p. 76), also shows that Dr. Whitman's national work of some kind was well known in 1851-2, for Saint Amant speaks of him as having been a very active agent of the American interests, and one who contributed in no small degree to promote annexation. If he did not refer to the work of Dr. Whitman discussed in this pamphlet, the question is here asked to what work of the Doctor does he refer? If he learned this from the Catholic priests, it was publicly known. In the writer's opinion this statement of Saint Amant and those of the other persons mentioned in this section, answer the statement of Prof. Bourne, that "the story first emerges over twenty years after the events, and seventeen years after Whitman's death." (7)

E. The next objection is that Dr. Whitman did nothing worth mentioning to induce people to come to Oregon in 1843.

Dr. Geiger's statement given above is that after the Doctor's interview at Washington, he sent back word to Missouri to those who wished to go to Oregon, and had the announcement of his prospective return published in the papers and in a pamphlet.*

In order to settle this question as far as possible the writer has been trying for nearly twenty years to learn what reason caused the emigrants of 1843 to start. Thus far he has learned in regard to thirty-eight. It is not necessary to reproduce here the letters of those who were not influenced in any way by Dr. Whitman to come. They were Hon. Jesse Applegate, Hon. Lindsay Applegate, A. Hill, Mr. Matheny, W. J. Dougherty, J. B. McLane, J. G. Baker, J. M. Shively, N. H. Sitton, Mrs. Jesse Looney, P. G. Stewart, W. C. Hembree, H. A. Straight, D. S. Holman,

*The objection has been raised more than once that this was not so because no such pamphlet and no such statements in the papers have been found. This to the writer is a feeble objection, for he has lived so long on the frontier that he knows that many pamphlets go so completely out of existence that some are never found and some only by the merest accident. It is almost or quite impossible often to find full files of the papers published in the forties. Even books go to the unknown. For example the writer has never seen Palmer's Travels over the Rocky mountains in 1845-6, a book of 189 pages, although two editions were published in 1847 and 1852; and yet he has tried to obtain a copy both in the east and west for nearly 20 years. All he knows of it is from the testimony of those who have seen it. It is many more times probable that a small pamphlet of 1843 would go to the unknown, when those interested in it could not well bring it to Oregon with them, for they had to leave everything they could, and those not interested would throw it away.

William Wilson, S. M. Gilmore, H. D. O'Bryant, O. Brown, J. Athey, Hon. J. W. Nesmith, Gov. P. H. Burnett and W. T. Newby, twenty-two.

On the other hand sixteen, or more than two-fifths came because of the Doctor's representations, namely: Nathan Eaton, Charles Eaton, A. J. Hembree, J. A. Stoughton, P. B. Whitman, Nineveh Ford, W. Martin, J. P. Martin, Enoch Garrison, J. Zachary, (and several of his neighbors), Miles Eyers, E. Smith, Mr. Ricord, John Hobson, William Waldo, and Mrs. C. B. Cary. Mr. Waldo says:

"Dr Whitman was in some of the eastern states in the winter of 1842-3, and wrote several newspaper articles in relation to Oregon, and particularly in regard to the health of the country. These letters decided my father to move to this country, as he had already decided to leave Missouri."

Says Mrs. C. B. Cary:

"It was a pamphlet Dr. Whitman wrote that induced me to come to Oregon."

Mr. Hobson says it was Dr. Whitman's personal talk that decided his father's family to come.* Mr. Stewart, already mentioned as not having been induced by Dr. Whitman to come, adds that a number of wagons overtook him after starting, who he afterwards learned were induced by the Doctor to come to Oregon. Mrs. Enoch Garrison said that they read circulars issued by Dr. Whitman that caused them to come.

---

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet for several of these letters on both sides.

Prof. Bourne thinks that John Zachary's letter was doctored by Mr. Spalding because it said that Dr. Whitman in his pamphlet announced that he had taken a wagon to the Columbia. This would not be strictly true, though it was true that Dr. Whitman had taken his wagon to the waters which flow into the Columbia, or to the Columbia basin, and a wagon had been taken as near to the Columbia river as Dr. Whitman's station was, (twenty miles) before he left for the east. Mr. Zachary's memory was as likely to fail on this point as Mr. Spalding was to doctor the letter. But in regard to the letters written by these others, they were not doctored by Mr. Spalding, for they were not written until eight years after his death.

Reference has been made (above, p. 10) to Prof. Bourne's remarks about the probability that these persons were induced to come because of the representations of Dr. White, instead of Dr. Whitman, getting the two persons confounded.* He says plainly

*To the writer it seems very strange that any one should charge the emigrants of 1843 with confounding Dr. White with Dr. Whitman. They were entirely different men. The former lived in the Willamette valley with the settlers, the latter east of the Cascade mountains, distant from them. The former was a sub-Indian agent after they arrived, the only United States officer in Oregon, the latter a missionary. The former was in Oregon when they came, the latter came with them and aided them in finding the way. The former went east in 1845 unregretted by very many, the latter was killed in 1847 and some of those emigrants fought and suffered to punish his murderers. The writer would as soon think of charging Prof. Bourne in the east with confounding Presidents Fillmore and Tyler because W. H. Gray in Oregon did for the reason that both had the same title to their names, as to charge the emigrants of 1843 in Oregon with confounding Dr. Whitman and Dr. White because the Pittsburg Chronicle in the east did, for the reason that the first part of their names was alike.

that the recollections of all those who were children or youth refer to Dr. White and not to Dr. Whitman. But the list of all the men over eighteen capable of bearing arms, of the emigrants of 1843, contains the names of all the above men except P. B. Whitman and William Waldo, while a Mr. M. Carey is mentioned. (There is a slight difference in the initials of Mr. Stoughton, in one list it being J. A. and in the other A.*) The writer thinks that these persons, even those under eighteen, know much better who induced them to emigrate than did Prof. Bourne fifty-eight years later.

J. G. Prentiss, a brother of Mrs. Whitman, wrote in 1883, of Dr. Whitman's anxiety to get all to go with him whom he came in contact with in Almond, N. Y., where he then lived, in West Almond where he lived in 1843, and on his way to Cuba, where his parents lived. Whitman would have it that his

> "parents, Judge Prentiss and wife, might endure the journey, and his solicitations outside of the family were just as urgent, portraying the beauties of the country to all that would listen to his story."*

Prof. Bourne states that the emigrants did not have time enough to get ready to move unless they had begun before the Doctor's arrival (93). Mr. Evans is quoted to sustain this (104) in saying that "in those early days the Oregon emigration had to arrange in the fall of the preceding year for the next

*Transactions Oregon Pioneer Society, 1875, p. 49-51.
*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 34.

year's great journey." It might be so with those who own the large residences in Connecticut, where the writer lived for nearly three years, but in the west where the cabin is sometimes not worth fifty dollars and all the household goods not over a hundred, it is quite easy to trade off a few things for another wagon or cattle, to sell a few, leave a few to be disposed of by relations or friends, give away a few, throw away a few, put the rest and the wife and children into the wagon and start! (The writer moved from Idaho to Washington on less than a month's notice, although three months before he had decided to live there permanently, and had newly furnished his house. Before he was twenty-one he had never lived in the same place five years and he is certain that generally his father moved inside of six weeks after deciding to do so, and one of his most important moves was on a week's notice. If the Professor had lived in Washington since the Klondike excitement, he could have seen many a family get the fever and move to Alaska on less than a six weeks' decision. He has probably never heard the story of the western man who had become so accustomed to moving that when his chickens saw the wagon driven up, they lay down on their backs to have their legs tied so as to be ready to go!)

Hon. L. Applegate, an emigrant of 1843, has constantly agreed with Prof. Bourne's side and so cannot be accused of distorting facts to prove that the writer is correct and Messrs. Evans and Bourne mistaken even on this point. Yet he says that the first movement of which he knows in getting

up the emigration of 1843 was when, because of information which he and his brother had received from a man who had crossed the plains previously, he put a notice in the Booneville Herald, of Missouri, about the first of March, 1843, to the effect that there would be an effort to get up an emigration to Oregon, and he says that about the same time there was a similar effort in the north part of the state. About the first of May they were ready to go.*

Hence the evidence is that there was time after Dr. Whitman reached Missouri for people to get ready to go and that he did influence a fair share of the emigrants to start.

F. A final objection is that the Doctor's efforts to get the emigration through with wagons were of no absolute importance. The fact is, this was the important final act of his work.

(a) Dr. Whitman wrote July 22, 1843:

"No one but myself was present to give them the assurance of getting through, which was necessary to keep up their spirits, and to counteract reports which were destined to meet and dishearten them at every stage of the journey."*

Hon. Jesse Applegate, although not induced to start by the Doctor, says:

---

*Eells-Whitman Pamphlet, p. 27, which the author had sent both to Prof. Bourne and Mr. Evans before they published their statements.

*American Historical Review, January, 1901, p. 293.

"To no other individual are the emigrants of 1843 so indebted for the successful conclusion of their journey as to Dr. Marcus Whitman."*

Although Dr. Whitman assisted them materially before reaching Fort Hall yet it was at that place that the real battle was fought for the emigration. To this place in 1840 Rev. H. Clark and associates had come with wagons, but they had left them there, because they were told it was impracticable if not impossible to take them farther. In 1842 the same misrepresentations were again successful with the first regular company of emigrants of 137 persons led by Dr. E. White. Even two years later, after the emigrations of 1843 and 1844 had taken their wagons through, Captain Grant worked hard to induce the emigrants to go to California, because of the dangers of the route to the Columbia river. But the emigrants of 1845 knew that those of 1844 and 1843 had taken their wagons through; those of 1844 knew the same to be true of those of 1843; but those of 1843 had no such precedent before them—in fact, no precedent but failure.

P. L. Edwards came to Oregon overland in 1834 as a lay missionary of the Methodist Episcopal church in company with Rev. Jason Lee. He afterwards returned to Missouri, became a member of the legislature of that state and is spoken of by the editor of the New Era of St. Louis, as a man "who enjoys the confidence of his fellow citizens in an eminent de-

*Transactions Oregon Pioneer Association 1876, p. 64.

gree." In the New Era of May 25, 1843, is a letter from him dated September 15, 1842, of two columns of fine print, in which he tells the emigrants plainly that in his opinion they could not take their wagons through to the Columbia river and should lay their plans accordingly.

Dr. Whitman evidently realized as much as Captain Grant did that here was the key to Oregon, and he proposed to unlock the door. It is doubtful whether any other man could have done so. He knew that in 1836 he had taken a cart as far as Fort Boise. He knew, according to the statement of Hon. Elwood Evans, that in 1840 Dr. Robert Newell, Col. J. L. Meek, and two others, had taken three wagons to Walla Walla; and, although Dr. Newell had found it so difficult that he had, on his arrival at Dr. Whitman's expressed his regret that he had undertaken the job, yet Dr. Whitman had said to him: "Oh, you will never regret it. You have broken the ice, and, when others see that wagons have passed, they, too, will pass, and in a few years the valley will be full of our people."

At an opportune moment, when Dr. Whitman was absent from camp at Fort Hall, similar discouraging representations were made to the emigrants of 1843. They were told that they must trade off their wagons or go to California. When Dr. Whitman came into camp he found them in a sad state; some in tears, some almost ready to accept the statements made, and some, according to Mrs. C. S. Pringle, his adopted daughter, were about ready to deal summar-

ily with the Doctor for having induced them to come on such a trip. But he knew that "what man had done, man could do," and, at this juncture, is said to have addressed them substantially as follows: "My countrymen, you have trusted me thus far; believe me now. I will take your wagons to the Columbia river."

Says Hon. J. W. Nesmith of this event:

"Captain Grant endeavored to dissuade us from proceeding further with our wagons, and showed us the wagons that the emigrants of the preceding year had abandoned, as an evidence of the impracticability of our determination. Dr. Whitman was persistent in his assertion that wagons could proceed as far as the Grand Dalles of the Columbia river, from which point he asserted they could be taken down by rafts or batteaux to the Willamette valley, while our stock could be driven by an Indian trail over the Cascade mountains, near Mount Hood. Happily, Whitman's advice prevailed, and a large number of the wagons, with a portion of the stock, did reach Walla Walla and The Dalles, from which points they were taken to the Willamette the following year. Had we followed Grant's advice, and abandoned the cattle and wagons at Fort Hall, much suffering must have ensued, as a sufficient number of horses to carry the women and the children of the party could not have been obtained; besides, wagons and cattle were indispensable to men expecting to live by farming in a country destitute of such articles."*

Says Orus Brown:

"I asked Captain Grant if he thought we could get through with our wagons; he answered, 'Yes, if you have a regiment to each wagon.'"*

---

*Transactions Oregon Pioneer Society 1875, p. 47.

*Letter to H. H. Spalding of Jan. 16, 1868, now in possession of the writer.

H. D. O'Bryant says that he heard Captain Grant repeatedly make the assertion that the wagons of the emigrants could not reach Oregon; that it was a worthless country; that there was no timber on the Columbia river except driftwood, but California was a splendid country, and he advised the emigrants by all means to go to California.*

Very similar testimony has been given by Governor P. H. Burnett and J. Baker about the affair at Fort Hall.

As to the Doctor's assistance after leaving the Fort, it is best given in the words of Capt. O'Bryant.:

"Now as regards the services of the Doctor, as regarded the then situation of Oregon, they were invaluable. The services the Doctor rendered emigrants before reaching Fort Hall were of immense value. From the Fort the journey commenced in earnest. This was the most difficult part of the way,* and the portion of country Captain Grant said the wagons could not pass and it was useless to undertake it; but in the face of all this, the Doctor brought the emigration, wagons and all, through safely, and I say without fear of contradiction that the services the Doctor rendered the emigration from Fort Hall to The Dalles were invaluable."

Says P. G. Stewart:

"The Doctor was of more service to us to that point [Fort Hall] than was our pilot. I do not know what we would have done had not Dr. Whitman told us how and where to cross and recross Snake river, and he saved us much time in getting through the Burnt river country; besides he sent an Indian to pilot us through the Blue mountains. Finally I would say that

*Ditto of March 5, 1868.

*Bancroft's Oregon uses a very similar expression, p. 399.

if Dr. Whitman did not get up the emigration of 1843 he fetched us safely through."*

This emigration outnumbered all of the Hudson Bay Company employees and Red River emigrants, and showed our government that an emigration could reach the Columbia river, so that after that, the Americans had no idea of allowing any of the country south of the present line, which divides Washington from British Columbia, to fall into the hands of Great Britain. It actually saved the country to the United States.

Judge William Strong, in an address before the Oregon Pioneer Society in 1878, said:

"The arrival of the emigration of 1843 may be considered the turning point in the history of Oregon. It gave the American population in the Territory control of its civil affairs, attracted the attention and excited the interest of the citizens and public authorities of the United States in this then almost unknown land, and thus contributed materially to the determination of the boundary question. It made Oregon of too great importance to permit diplomacy to trifle it away. It brought to the valley a large band of improved horses and cattle. It afforded the settlers the means of making themselves at home in the country, and filled their hearts with hope of being again surrounded by American citizens."*

And Honorable Elwood Evans, in a letter to the writer, says:

---

*Letter to writer of August 4, 1887. Remember that these four witnesses, Nesmith, Brown, O'Bryant and Stewart were not influenced by the Doctor to start, nor were Messrs. Burnett and Baker.

*Transactions Oregon Pioneer Society 1878, p. 15.

"We zealously unite in ascribing to that visit the greatest results in the future of Oregon; the grandest services to that large train; the importance that flowed from his successful leading of that train through to the Columbia with their wagons. Those results, those conclusions, are glorious to Dr. Whitman's memory."

This determined which of the two countries should hold the country by right of settlement. Nor did its influence cease with the year's emigration. The success of this company in reaching Oregon induced another company to start the next year. Says Mrs. C. S. Pringle, who came in 1844, after speaking of Dr. Whitman's marking the route and guiding the emigrants of 1843: "So well known was this fact in the western states that Whitman and Oregon were the watch words of the emigration of 1844."

There at Fort Hall the final conquest was made, which resulted in the United States obtaining possession of a good share, at least, of this Northwest coast. Previous to 1836, when Dr. Whitman came to the coast, in nearly every contest which the Americans had had with the British subjects here they had been defeated. Several fur companies, among which were the Pacific Fur Company, with John Jacob Astor at its head, the Missouri Fur Company, the Rocky Mountain Fur Company, Wyeth's Salmon Cannery and Trading Company, Captain Bonneville, and others, which swelled the number to eleven, had fought the battle with the Hudson Bay Company and retired defeated. The American Society for Encouraging Settlements in the Oregon Territory, with Hall J. Kelly at its head, had lost $30,000 and retired from

the field. Astoria, built in 1811, before the Hudson Bay Company was here, and Fort Hall, built in 1834, by N. J. Wyeth, had fallen into the hands of the enemy. Thus, previous to 1834, every American effort was defeated. In that year Rev. Jason Lee and others crossed the continent, and, though it was not in their first plan, actually began a settlement in the Willamette, which greatly assisted in the final victory. The same year Rev. Samuel Parker began to arouse the Congregational and Presbyterian churches and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in regard to missions on this coast, and the next winter found Dr. Whitman and interested him in the work. Then it was that the tide began to turn in favor of the United States. In 1836, when Mrs. Spalding and Mrs. Whitman crossed the Rocky mountains, the first white women who ever did so, it was a victory. When, during the same journey, Dr. Whitman brought the first wagon that ever broke the sagebrush from the Rocky mountains to Fort Boise, it was another victory. When, four years later, Dr. Robert Newell and company took three wagons to Walla Walla, the enemy was again overcome. When, again, Dr. Whitman made his journey east in 1843 through terrible suffering, and gave such information at Washington that the opinions of the rulers as to the value of the country and the possibility of reaching it with wagons were changed, still another victory was won. But the results of all these would have been well nigh or completely lost had Captain Grant at Fort Hall induced the emigration

of 1843 to do as he wished. There was no flourish of trumpets or sound of drums, no rattle of musketry or roar of cannon at that battle. The contest was simply between two men, and was a battle of brains and diplomacy, but the results of it were greater than oftentimes when many thousands have been slain. Each of the parties felt in a measure the responsibility, and Whitman won.

Fort Hall had been built nine years previous by an American, but in the contest between the trading companies quickly fell into the hands of the British. Now it was the scene of another contest, when settlements, not furs, were at stake, and the Americans gained the victory. All that was done after this was simply to gather up the spoils and make the treaty of peace. And when, in 1846, the treaty was signed between Great Britain and the United States, it was simply writing in an official way what had been written *de facto* three years previous at Fort Hall.

Says Dr. William Barrows:

"In later days, when the spirit of war was aroused for the whole of Oregon or war, the question was raised whether it was to be taken under the walls of Quebec or on the Columbia. Neither was the place. Oregon was taken at Fort Hall; for it will be seen that from this time the grand result in the Oregon case was no longer an open and doubtful issue; only details and minor adjustments required attention."*

Dr. Whitman took the same view of affairs, for he wrote to the American Board April 1, 1847, as follows:

---

*Barrows' Oregon, p. 249.

"I often reflect on the fact that you told me you were sorry that I came (East). It did not then, nor has it since, altered my opinion in the matter. American interests acquired in the country, which the success of the immigration of 1843 alone did and could have secured, have become the foundation of the late treaty between England and the United States in regard to Oregon, for it may be easily seen what would have become of American interests in the country had the emigration of 1843 been as disastrous as were the emigrations of 1845 and 1846," (both of those years his route having been abandoned for another.)

"The disaster was great again last year to those who left the track which I made for them in 1843, as it has been in every attempt to improve it. Not that it cannot be improved, but it demonstrates what I did in making my way to the states in the winter of 1842-3, after the 3d of October. It was to open a practical route and safe passage, and secure a favorable report of the journey from emigrants, which, in connection with other objects, caused me to leave my family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey, notwithstanding the unusual severity of the winter and the great depth of snow."

And again, October 18, 1847, about six weeks before his death, he wrote to the same Board:

"Two things, and it is true those which were the most important, were accomplished by my return to the states. By means of the establishment of the wagon road, which is due to that effort alone, the emigration was secured and saved from disaster in the fall of 1843. Upon that event the present acquired rights of the United States by her citizens hung. And not less certain is it that upon the result of emigration to this country the present existence of this mission and of Protestantism hung, also."

And in England the same view has been taken. A writer in the British Colonial Magazine said:

"By a strange and unpardonable oversight of the local offi-

cers, missionaries from the United States were allowed to take religious charge of the population, and these artful men lost no time in introducing such a number of their countrymen as reduced the influence of the British settlers to complete insignificance."*

Hence, Rev. H. H. Spalding was not far from the truth when he wrote that, when the rear of Dr. Whitman's caravan emerged "from the western shades of the Blue mountains upon the plains of the Columbia, the greatest work was finished ever accomplished by one man for Oregon."

Soon after reaching Waiilatpu he notified the secretary of war of the safe arrival of the emigration in the letter which accompanied his proposed bill for the action of congress.

Thus it appears, on looking at the evidence, that all these objections disappear, and that the story is not a romance or fiction when it is said that Dr. Whitman saved Oregon to the United States. In saying this, however, the writer does not intend to disparage the work of others, which was of inestimable value, in saving Oregon. The work of saving Oregon was like a chain, of many links. If any one link had been broken, the whole would have been lost. Dr. Whitman saved his one link, others saved other links. But the writer contends for Dr. Whitman because it has been denied that he saved this one link. Just how

*See Missionary Herald, Dec. 1866, p. 374.

much of Oregon was saved, the writer has never decided, but for nearly twenty years has stated, "the whole or a part of it." The papers found in regard to the trade for California and Webster's statement point to that part north of the Columbia river. But the statement of Sir Robert Peel, Dr. Whitman's letters, and the ideas of Judge Strong and some other western statesmen point to all of the then Oregon.

In conclusion it may be worth while to hear some estimates which have been given concerning Dr. Whitman.

Says Hon. Archibald McKinley, who was in charge of Fort Walla Walla in 1842:

"He was a very superior man. His whole soul was devoted to civilizing and Christianizing the Indians. A true patriot withal, but not the sort that make fools of themselves."

Says Hon. W. F. Tolmie, who, like Mr. McKinley, belonged to the Hudson's Bay Company:

"With Mr. McKinley, I retain my high opinion of the noble, true-hearted Whitman."

Says the Hon. O. C. Pratt:

"Dr. Whitman was a grand character, a leading man, and one of great power wherever the lines of his life fell; and he impressed himself on his contemporaries in Oregon in a way never to be forgotten as long as any of them may live."

Says United States Senator James K. Kelly:

"While he was sincere and zealous in the discharge of his duties as a missionary among the Indians, yet he was all alive to the importance of securing Oregon as an American possession against the claims of Great Britain. He was intensely American in all his feelings; a man of indomitable will and perseverance in whatever he undertook to accomplish; whom no danger could daunt and no hardship could deter from the performance of any act which he deemed it a duty to discharge."

Says Hon. W. Lair Hill:

"But only the pioneer missionary, Dr. Whitman, appears to have had clear views from the first of the possibilities of the Northwest coast, and its importance as a part of the United States. He and Thomas H. Benton were the prophets of Oregon."

Says the Oregonian:

"He was an energetic, heroic, far-seeing, self-sacrificing and thoroughly patriotic American citizen, and his name is embalmed forever in the history of the northwest. It falls to the lot of but few to win fame, and few there are who so well deserve it."

Says Governor Elwood Evans of the Doctor and his wife:

"Pages could be devoted to the praise of their many good works. They were philanthropists, practical, devoted Christians."

Says Bancroft in his "Oregon:"

"The missionary, Dr. Whitman, was no ordinary man. I do not know which to admire most in him, his coolness or his courage. His nerves were of steel, his patience was excelled only by his fearlessness; in the mighty calm of his nature he was a Caesar for Christ."

Says Prof. Bourne:

"Marcus Whitman was a devoted and heroic missionary, who braved every hardship, and imperilled his life for the cause of Christian civilization in the northwest, and finally died at his post, a sacrifice to the cause." (p. 100).

These statements are a fitting reply to Prof. Marshall's statement that Dr. Whitman "was not above a third or fourth rate man." (p. 232).

ERRATA AND ADDENDA.

Page 6, line 28. For (195) read (105).

" 7, lines 3 and 4. For (291) read (231).

" 12, line 24. Insert "disquieting" before "vox clamantis."

" 20, line 16. For (23) read (231).

" 20, line 29. For (229) read (228).

" 40, line 15. Insert:

In fact this is a principle of law, that the evidence of witnesses is not to be rejected because they may be obliged to depend on their memories, even though many years may elapse between the occurrence of the event about which the testimony is given and the time when the evidence is given in court. For instance, if a murder is committed before witnesses and the murderer escapes and is not found for forty years, the evidence of the witnesses who can then be obtained is not rejected because of the intervening time, but is accepted as long as the witnesses shall live. It may be weakened because of the long time, but it is not rejected.

" 46, line 15. For (289) read (85).

" 51, second footnote. For p. 697 read p. 696.

" 95, line 17. For E read D.